

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, May 11th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker -- oh, go ahead.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is a -- I am almost overwhelmed by the hon. minister. Maybe we are finally getting him educated, but that isn't really what I stood up to do.

It is my pleasure to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the Assembly a group of students from Devon High School. I say, without fear of prejudice, that they are indeed an exceptional group of young men and women. It just happens to be that they come from my home town and my daughter is amongst them, but be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, they are a class of 50. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Holman, Mr. Baptist and their driver Mr. McLeod. I would like them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I too have a great deal of pleasure in introducing a class to the Assembly. I would like to introduce a class of 50 students and their teacher Mrs. R. Littke from the Fulton Place School in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar. These students are Grade V students, well versed in matters associated with ecology and pollution. Perhaps they could stand and be recognized by the House.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to also introduce to you and through you to the members of this House, 29 Grade VI students from the Rudolph Henning School in Port Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate for the information of the members and the young people that this school was named after Rudolph Henning who was a member of the Legislature from 1929 to 1935. He was also a long-time trustee in the area and he received his honorary Doctorate from the University of Alberta a year or two ago, just before his death. The students are accompanied by Mr. Alexandriuk, Mrs. Richardson, Mrs. Miller, and Mrs. Miller. They are to your right and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

48-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file returns to Notice of Motion 182 and also Notice of Motion 189 as ordered by this Assembly.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Chain Corner Grocery Stores

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Attorney General. Has the hon. minister made any investigations into the alleged unfair competition provided by big-time chain corner grocery stores which is posing a threat to the continued existence of the small corner store business in Calgary and Edmonton?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, without acceding to any of the assumptions in the hon. member's question, the answer is no.

MR. BENOIT:

Is it the intention of the hon. minister to make any investigation into the alleged situation?

MR. LEITCH:

I have no present intention, Mr. Speaker.

Natural Resources Revenue Plan Hearings

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, with respect to the hearings which have been scheduled for Tuesday, May 23 on the Tentative Natural Resources Revenue Plan. Could the hon. minister indicate the number of groups or organizations who have filed a notice of intent to appear before the committee?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did check this morning with the chairman of the committee, the hon. Member for Ponoka, and he has furnished me with a list of those who filed notice of intention to supply briefs, and that will be furnished to committee members tomorrow. The list shows a number of 53.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Emergency Forage

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. This has to do with the serious hay situation that has developed in the Pincher Creek constituency, because of the extremely hard winter and two very dry years. My question is, is the hon. minister considering in any way some assistance to the people who are now faced with quite a serious economic crisis?

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-3

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, yes, we've been aware of the situation in the Pincher Creek area over the past two months, and my officials have worked out a scheme of assistance for the farmers in the area to get hay, primarily in the form of providing some freight assistance. The House will recall that this is one of the things that I have very strong views on, in regard to having a forage bank, and the department is also working on that -- probably in conjunction with some of the pelletizing operators throughout the province -- so that we will have, in the future, a reliable source of emergency forage.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Oil Production

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. President Nixon's recent announcement of 30,000 barrels increase a day of Canadian oil to be allowed into the American market -- I was wondering if the minister could inform the House as to whether we are in a position to fill the extra requirement under our present pro-ration in Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to advise that announcement was welcome news to the province. It's welcome from the point of view that as you know we have been urging and recommending further access to the United States market, so this is a step in the right direction that way. Also, when I did receive notice of the announcement, I checked with the department, and I'm pleased to advise all hon. members that it is significant that it is retroactive to January 1st, so that will mean additional revenue to the Province of Alberta of approximately \$5 million this year. At the same time we did notice in the report that there were some 200,000 barrels of off-shore oil that was being increased, and I think we have to watch that, because we are in competition with off-shore oil, and it does involve a question of price.

MR. DIXON:

A further supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. With our pro-ration system, how long do you think it may be before the government will have to give serious consideration to allowing our oil wells to produce a higher percentage than they are allowed to produce today?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think there's a great deal of speculation on that and I don't think the government would be in a position to give any definite figure, but I think we can say that the speculative figure that has been mentioned is perhaps two to three years.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

48-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

Sunflower Production

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Recently the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool raised their price on sunflower seeds from \$4 up to \$5.50 cwt., for one, two or three grades of seeds. I wonder if the Department of Agriculture will be promoting sunflowers in some of our areas here?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we are, and have, and are very fortunate in having join the Department of Agriculture in Alberta, Dave Durkson, who probably did more than anybody else in the grains trade in the special crop area. We feel very fortunate in having Mr. Durkson in our marketing organization. We're expanding and hope to expand the number of acres that can be usefully put into sunflowers. There are new techniques that are being developed to improve the yields, and we're hopeful that at the price it is now, it will be a worthwhile addition to our crops, particularly in the southern irrigation areas of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Power Rate Increase

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Has the minister received any indication, either formally or informally, from Calgary Power, that they plan to apply for a rate increase in the near future?

MR. WERRY:

With respect to that, Mr. Speaker, Calgary Power has indicated that because of their financing requirements for the Sundance III and IV, also the increased operating costs due to inflation and the interest charges that are required to finance Sundance III and IV that unless revenues increase in the next year or two, there was a strong possibility that there would be a rate increase. I haven't seen today's papers but I understand that Calgary Power did, in fact, have their annual meeting yesterday. I am sure the wording in their annual report for the year 1971 was very similar to the years 1969 and '70 which outlined the same general considerations.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. In view of the government's decision to commission an investigation of rural power requirements, can the hon. minister give the Assembly the assurance that in the event that Calgary Power does make a rate increase application that the Public Utilities Board will not hear that application until such time as the farm organizations and the rural electrification associations in the province have an opportunity to consider in depth the report of the government, and to make representation to the Cabinet on that report?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly hypothetical. It could perhaps be put in a different way, but in its present form it is contrary to the rules.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-5

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question then, in that case, Mr. Speaker, or rephrasing of it. . .

MR. COCKSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't know the exact ruling, but there is a question in my mind whether you can have a supplementary to a hypothetical question.

MR. SPEAKER:

I assume, although it was called a supplementary, it is a substitute question.

MR. NOTLEY:

Substitute question then, Mr. Speaker. The substitute question is simply this: can the hon. minister advise the Legislature whether or not he will ask the Public Utilities Board to delay any hearings on a rate increase application until after the various organizations concerned have had an opportunity to study and make representation on the government's report into rural electrification costs?

MR. WERRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, because that is not within government's jurisdiction. I think the hon. member misunderstands the responsibility and administrative function of the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board is a quasi-judicial body that does not report to any minister. It reports to Executive Council. It is an independent board. If any public or private utility company in the province requires a rate increase they apply to the independent body, the Public Utilities Board. Government, in no way, can exercise any authority over public or private utilities in making applications to that board, because that board is independent.

There are two stages in any rate application. The private utility that is requesting a rate increase first of all makes the application and files all of the documentation as to why they should be granted a rate increase. Then there is an interval, usually of two or three months in there, where people are allowed to intervene. By 'people' I mean organizations or municipalities or any interested party, is allowed to file evidence as to why that utility should not in fact, receive a rate increase; or they can question certain facts that are in the original presentation by the utility company.

At the close of that period the Public Utilities Board then sets an actual rate hearing. Then all of the evidence is presented by the utility company, and their witnesses are allowed to be cross-examined by any intervener, so there is adequate opportunity during both the period for the interveners to intervene, and also during the hearing, for any interested party to present alternative evidence or question that utility's operations or any item that is presented in their evidence requesting a rate increase.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Telephones. Has the hon. minister received any indication from Canadian Utilities that an application is to be made for a rate increase in the Drumheller-Stettler area?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is no such company as Canadian Utilities, Ltd. There is no indication either in their annual report or in any

48-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

-----  
conversations that I have heard amongst utility people that Alberta Power will require a rate increase this year or next year, and I don't know when they will.

MR. FRENCH:

Is it not right that Alberta Power, although known at that time as Canadian Utilities, did receive a price increase two or three years ago, and Calgary Power did not apply for a rate increase?

MR. WERRY:

Well, if memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that under the previous administration, it was three years ago February, that Canadian Utilities and also Northland Utilities did in fact receive a rate increase. In answer to the second part to the hon. member for Hanna-Oyen, Calgary Power has never requested a rate increase in all of its history in Alberta.

MR. JAMISON:

Is it not correct, Mr. Minister, that Calgary Power has not had a rate increase in 60 years, and in fact, in 1958 had a decrease?

MR. WERRY:

That is correct also, Mr. Speaker. They have had three rate decreases during that period, so this would be the first increase if they do apply -- I don't know when -- if they do make their application that, would be, in fact, their first rate increase.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

Export-Import Ratio: Alberta-Japan

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Inasmuch as the Canadian exports to Japan are now less than the imports, approximately what is the current Alberta-Japanese import-export ratio?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if he'll put that on the Order Paper I will be delighted to get the information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Private Nursing Home Contract Rates

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Could you give some indication as to when adjustments to contract rates for private nursing homes will be announced?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that it will probably be announced within a short time, certainly before the end of the session, as I

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-7

anticipate it to end. I have no announcement to be made at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

Mosquito Control

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the hon. Minister reached a decision in connection with the co-ordinating of a provincial-wide mosquito control program?

DR. HOENNER:

As I indicated in the House some time ago, after the hon. member brought up this suggestion and having discussions with the people in my department in this area, we have to I think, have a very hard look at the situation because a province-wide mosquito control program with chemicals would have some pretty major effects on the environment generally, particularly insofar as some of the other species of life are concerned, and I am talking about frogs, birds, snakes, etc. Frankly much more is involved than appears on the surface, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to have more time to discuss it with my colleagues in the Department of the Environment and discuss it in relation to those effects on the environment generally.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood followed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt.

Special Opportunity Classes

MRS. CHICHAK:

I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Education, Mr. Hyndman. Are you giving consideration with respect to some change in the method of funding special opportunity classes in the school grant support program for 1973, and as well, will you enquire where the greatest support may be obtained from the federal government in this area? I ask this question because of representations that are being made from my constituents.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, for 1973, certainly the question of special education as it relates to children with handicaps will be receiving priority attention regarding such funding as may be appropriate for the plan next year. Regarding the question with respect to funds available, that is not an area where there is any federal assistance at this time, but I will certainly give consideration to the suggestion made.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt, followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

48-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

Barley Production and Markets

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Upon your return from Ottawa today, sir, and your important meeting with Mr. Otto Lang, have you anything to report to this House?

DR. HORNER:

Only Mr. Speaker, that we did in fact meet -- the three western Ministers of Agriculture with Mr. Lang, yesterday. I might say this to the House, that the meeting was concerned about the availability of product markets in the future, particularly insofar as barley is concerned, and to try and work out some way in which we could encourage the farmers of western Canada to, in fact, increase their plantings of barley, as opposed to the increase that they've indicated in wheat. We're hopeful that the four governments can, in fact, give some leadership in this area to increase the number of acres that farmers intend to plant to barley and lower wheat market commitments in the coming year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, do we have an increase in the price of barley?

DR. HORNER:

The minister responsible for the Wheat Board has announced an increase of 5 cents a bushel in the new crop year. Whether or not this is going to be enough incentive to encourage more planting of barley, was in fact the gist of the meetings we had with the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

Motor Vehicle Operation by Children

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my question to the hon. Attorney General. In view of the news in the Edmonton Journal of the death of a 13-year-old boy who was driving a tractor on Highway 57 in my constituency, what are the conditions to stop -- or what can be done to stop -- this useless slaughter of our children on our highways? How can this be stopped?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all familiar with the incident to which the hon. member refers. Without knowing the circumstances and the facts, I would have a little difficulty answering the question.

MR. ZANDER:

Supplementary, could he at least shed some light on what is the age limit of a child operating a farm tractor on any of our highways and roads in the province?



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-9

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is, in fact, asking a question of law.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Off-track Betting

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. What is the government's present policy regarding off-track betting in Alberta?

I think that this question was previously asked, but in view of the fact that the racing season is upon us, I wonder if you would mind re-stating the policy.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that was raised before. The answer I gave then is the answer that still applies today -- namely, that until the federal government moves in this area and provides the provincial governments the authority to deal with off-track betting, it's in limbo. I haven't heard anything from the federal government recently that would indicate they are going to introduce legislation in the immediate future.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary. In other words, it is not permitted as far as you're concerned. I wonder how the Attorney General would like to deal with this one. This is from The Albertan:

"Off-track betting on flat races will begin Friday or Monday, Ken Williams said Wednesday. His company was closed last summer by police, but last July obtained a ruling from the Supreme Court of Canada that his system of placing off-track betting in Edmonton on races in Calgary is legal."

Now, I would assume that this company will be in operation either Friday or Monday. Now how do you propose to deal with this?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a slightly different question than the one I earlier answered. What I was talking about there was an off-track betting facility that would be somewhat along the lines of an existing pari-mutuel betting facility. The betting system to which the hon. member refers is a different thing. It is more in the nature of a messenger service, and as I recall the facts of the case, people would purchase the ticket, and then they charged a fee for cashing it. Charges were laid in respect to that operation last year, I believe. As I recall it, I think there may have been a conviction at the lower court level, and it was then overturned at the higher court level.

Now that's simply a question, Mr. Speaker, of dealing with the applicable law. It's a federal law, it falls within the Criminal Code, and this particular activity isn't covered. So that's really an area in which the province is not, at the moment, empowered to act.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, do you plan to prosecute again, or will you just let it ride?

48-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. LEITCH:

That, Mr. Speaker, will depend on the facts of the case. It would, in my view, be pointless to prosecute a case where the facts are identical to those in which the court has said there is no offense. Now each of these prosecutions depends on the particular facts of the case and it may be that in the contemplated operation the facts will be different from those that were brought before the court in the earlier action. If that is so we will again have to examine whether or not, in our view, what's being done is contrary to the law. If it is we'll then lay charges. It's simply a question of whether in our view what's being done is a breach of the law -- if it is, charges will be laid.

MR. HO LEM:

In other words I take it that your department will be keeping close scrutiny on this operation?

MR. LEITCH:

The hon. member is right.

MR. WILSON:

Inasmuch as this messenger service business is handling public funds, are they required to be bonded or licensed or are there any restrictions on the manner in which they handle public funds in the Province of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

I'm not at all sure, Mr. Speaker, that I would accept the implication that these are public funds. Again I would have to check the exact system of the operation before being able to give a definite answer, but I wouldn't regard public funds to be those where one person hands money to another for the purposes of purchasing a ticket on a bet.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Bonnyville.

#### Rundle Lodge Preservation

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. It's regarding the Rundle Lodge in the City of Calgary and the disposal of the old buildings. I was wondering if the hon. minister is in a position today to announce if he has set up a committee to make recommendations in this matter and, if he has, if he could give us the names of the members and when he expects the report to be brought down?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, with the excellent co-operation of the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Dr. Winston Backus, we have listened to both sides of the Rundle Lodge controversy in Calgary and have decided that we should set up a committee to look into the preservation of Rundle Lodge. It is called the Advisory Committee For the Preservation of Rundle Lodge. It is set up with five members of the Historic Sites Advisory Committee and two additional members. The Historic Sites Advisory Committee also consists of some members of the Civil Service but we excluded these members since we felt it should be an independent report, independent of government.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-11

We expect the public hearing on that to be held in Calgary by the end of this month. The notice in the paper should appear very shortly and, hopefully, by about June 25th or the end of June, the report should be back with us regarding the preservation, use, and/or demolition of Rundle Lodge.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I wonder if the minister is in a position to give us the names of the people from the historical society who will be serving on this committee?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I will gladly furnish the names to the hon. member if he so desires.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bonnyville followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

#### Soft Drink Container Refunds

MR. HANSEN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. It has been brought to my attention that in certain areas certain dealers only pay one cent per bottle or can, other dealers are paying the two cents which the government set out, and it is causing quite a bit of trouble. They are overstocked with bottles and cans where they pay the two cents and the other ones are getting away from taking them back.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to bring to our attention, at the earliest moment, the names of the companies that are, in fact, violating the legislation and the regulations. As a result, we will look after it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

#### Unconditional Grants to Municipalities

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the program directory, in the last section dealing with grants is the part that deals with the unconditional grants to the municipality, which last year was \$38 million and this year, \$42 million.

The statement is made here that the total amount distributed each year is set at a figure of \$44 million. Could you tell me if this is a typographical error, or if there is some significance here that I have not comprehended?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, that must be a typographical error, Mr. Speaker.

48-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Preservation of Rivers

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of the Environment. Is the government considering any 'wild rivers' legislation which has as its purpose the preservation of rivers in their untouched and natural state?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought before me in connection with several submissions, and it is my understanding that several jurisdictions in Canada are giving consideration to this type of legislation. It is not our intent, at this time, to bring in legislation of this type. However, we are making a number of changes to legislation in connection with the management of rivers. The pertinent one, of course, is that before water is impounded or diverted on any major river, that an act of the legislature will be required. This, of course, will be done for several reasons, one being to preserve the natural character of some of our waterways.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary. Is there any legislation presently in effect in Alberta, to preserve the natural state of our rivers?

MR. YURKO:

To my knowledge, there is no such legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Representation on Wheat Advisory Board Committee

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What representation did the hon. minister make to the federal government, requesting Alberta representation on the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, just recently announced?

MR. GETTY:

I didn't make any, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, then. Does this follow in the realm, then, of asking for more representation on federal marketing boards and other agencies, as exuded by the government?

DR. HORNER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright, of course, is being facetious again, Mr. Speaker. We have been in contact with the Wheat Board and have been making recommendations to them on a number of matters over the last several months. We have had substantially better relations with them than the previous government, who ignored them completely.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-13

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, then, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. What results have you had to date, then, and was there any government representation on the advisory committee that was announced, I believe, today?

DR. HORNER:

The results that we have achieved will be pretty well known to the farmers of Alberta over the coming months, Mr. Speaker. In relation to markets, in relation to the pricing mechanism, there is one problem that we have put before the Wheat Board, right at the present time, which I think is very important. It is the question of the barley sales freight being priced on Thunder Bay when, in fact, most of the barley being grown in Alberta, that is exported, is shipped through Vancouver. The producers in Alberta have been for the last twenty years, for as long as that pricing mechanism has been in effect in fact penalized by the board. We intend to try to do something about that particular one in the near future.

Part of the discussions that we had with Mr. Lang yesterday also concerned some of these matters in relation to how the Wheat Board affects the farmers in Alberta. While we think that the Wheat Board is a necessary commission to have, we also take the view that there should be some input insofar as the Alberta government is concerned, and we intend to continue to make those representations to the Board and to the Grains Council, as we think a provincial government should.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, then. Do I take it then, from the hon. minister, that there is no Alberta representation on the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Council just announced?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the announcement so I wouldn't be able to answer the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Restoration of Rutherford House

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can he advise the House as to what progress has been made on the restoration of Rutherford House, as provided for in last year's budget in the Department of Public Works?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have an up-to-date report on it, but certainly during the winter months considerable progress was made and quite a bit of work has gone into it. The final way in which it is restored is still dependent, to some extent, on the subsequent use. At the moment we are having quite a little bit of representation from various bodies as to the future use of Rutherford House. When we have finalized this, we will then be in a position to complete the restoration. But all the essential restoration has been carried out to protect it from further deterioration.

48-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

Friendship Centre Grants

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. By way of explanation, you will recall that last week I asked you about the concern expressed by a number of leaders of friendship centres about the delay in receiving their grants. At that time, if I recollect, you advised the House that you would investigate the matter. My question to you today is, are you in a position to advise the House what the result of your investigation is?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that so far as the province is concerned, that matter should be resolved within two weeks. I know that the hon. member refers to a press report where it was indicated it might take as long as the month of June. My inquiry indicates that that is not the case, that it can be done in a couple of weeks.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. In your investigations, were you able to determine whether or not the federal share of the cost-shared program did actually arrive and was received by the Alberta government in late March of this year?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the situation there. I am going to give this information now based upon my understanding of it at the moment, if it is subsequently different in any way, that could be ascertained. It is, in fact, a sum that is claimed back under a cost-sharing agreement. Therefore, federal funds as such don't arrive in advance of the event at all. The grant for support of the association is made and subsequently the federal share is paid after a claim is made by the province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

Gas Laser Development

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would like to know if he is aware of the development by the National Research Council of something which is called a gas laser and which has, so far, cost \$10,000. I would like to know if he is aware of the fact that scientific opinion holds that for \$500,000 this can be developed to the point where Canada would have absolute leadership of two or three years in what is referred to as a field of major scientific technology. I wonder, thirdly, if there is a policy of the Alberta Research Council that would enable the Alberta Research Council to pick up the development of this gas laser as apparently, because of indecision at the federal level, it stands in mortal danger of being discontinued?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now there is a question for you, Fred!

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-15

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, yes we are, in our department, aware of it. We are aware also that this sort of development that has taken place within the Research Council, and outside of it, is a very important part of the responsibility of our department to see in the future that proper funds are set aside for development so that these projects can be taken into production stage within the Province of Alberta by Albertans. Those projects that are of a technological or of a scientific nature, beyond the comprehension of the general public to invest. These are problems that are very difficult to explain in this House why governments do have a part to play, along with the free enterprise sector, in the development of such projects.

This particular project that the hon. member has referred to, we are watching it, and we will make sure that it stays and is developed within Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Soft Drink Container Refunds (Cont.)

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment, as a supplement to the question from the hon. Member for Bonnyville. Although depots and retailers are required to pay two cents per container for bottles and cans, what about those depots that offer a pick-up service. Are they required to pay two cents?

MR. YURKO:

The legislation says that the retailer must refund two cents to the purchaser of a soft drink bottle when that bottle or can or container is presented for a refund. There is nothing to prevent a company from setting itself up in the business of buying back bottles from the public and buying them back for one cent, or for, in fact, one and a half cents, and then the company that buys these bottles, or goes around and buys them from the public, can take them in and get the normal two cents returned from either the manufacturer or the retailer, which sold them in the first place. I believe this is what the hon. member desires as an answer to his question, but perhaps if he needs more clarification, he can either ask a supplementary, if I haven't interpreted his question right, or perhaps we can get together later and discuss this matter.

Barley Marketing

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture, which is more along the line of a supplementary on your Ottawa meeting. It has regard to the former Minister of the Wheat Board, and the former Minister of Agriculture in the federal government who said, "Grow more wheat and we'll sell it." In your meetings with your counterparts in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, are you, with your experience, fully satisfied that if you ask the farmers to grow more barley and they do, that we have a market for it?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that's what the outlook is. It is that there is, in fact, a market for additional supplies of barley. We're concerned in Alberta in that the off-board price for barley is now about 80 cents, which is considerably higher than the initial price from the

48-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

Canadian Wheat Board. This indicates the pretty narrow amount of supply that we have in Alberta at the present time in relation to barley, and certainly the Wheat Board loadings of barley in Alberta in the past two weeks have been very, very low, and most of the barley being delivered to the board right now is coming from Saskatchewan. There is practically none coming from Alberta, because, in essence, I don't think it's there, or it's being kept for non-board use in the feed mills. The outlook for the barley market is good. I would have liked to have been able to say to the farmers of Alberta that we were able to get an additional increase in the initial price, but this was not possible, having regard to world market prices. So the dampener, of course, is still the price, but there is a market for barley, generally in that price range.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether Alberta will still produce 50 per cent of the total barley in Canada? Is our proportion of the total market going to be practically the same?

DR. HORNER:

I would see it as being practically the same, because we're fortunate that our major barley market in Alberta is within Alberta in our livestock industry, which is not the case in the other two provinces. In other words, they may market more barley than we will through the Wheat Board channels, because of our own domestic market requirements here. I would think that the balance would pretty well remain the same.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In promoting increased barley acreage, does the minister feel that the announced price of barley is adequate to enable the producer to make a reasonable profit?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, as I said to the hon. Member for Macleod, I'm sure that all of us would be pleased if we could announce a higher price, but the additional five cents the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board announced some time ago, had to do with this very problem, that the increase in the initial five cents was, in fact, to try to encourage additional acreage being sowed to barley. When you talk about the cost of production in relation to barley, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this may vary pretty substantially from area to area and from farm to farm.

#### Teachers' Aides

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Hon. minister, do you support the concept of teacher aide so that the teacher can be relieved to carry out teaching, per se, and be relieved of administrative and various non-teaching duties?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this concept has been a special interest to me over the last few months. When one looks, for example, at many areas of activity where para-professionals are used in the dental profession, in the engineering profession and a great many others, it does seem to me that when we are now at the situation where most teachers are coming into schools with a substantial professional education, with a degree; that perhaps we should do more to ensure



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-17

that their abilities and their professional judgment, for which they are trained, can be freed from those aspects of the administrative classroom routine. I think the employment of teacher aides -- and there are many names for them -- might be one step in that direction.

I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the Worth Commission will speak directly to that subject. I am certainly in a position to follow it up very closely.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do you share the concern of many teachers who have indicated repeatedly that, in fact, a very expensive two-year post-secondary course for teacher's aide is not necessary, because, in fact, they will not be teaching or should not be teaching, and a six month course probably would suffice?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I am not able to draw a conclusion as to the validity or otherwise of that statement, Mr. Speaker. I think it should be remembered that to assist teachers in classrooms one can have resource people, such as even people in the community with a grade VI education or no formal education, who may well be able to contribute to the process of education, and who have no degree or no formal training, going all the way up the scale to those persons who perhaps have two degrees in theoretical physics. I think we have to look at the situation very broadly, and I don't think those involved in the teaching profession should be too concerned that there is any suggestion of bringing in teachers' aides, or of school boards doing this as an attempt to take over their jobs. I think in the long run, looking at the criteria of what is best for the delivery of services to the student, that the idea has much promise.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### QUESTIONS

196. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

1. With reference to Identification Cards on which the photograph of the true bearer appears:
  - (a) How many Identification Cards with photographs on same have been supplied by The Alberta Liquor Control Board during the fiscal year, April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972?
  - (b) Were these cards supplied free?
  - (c) If not province-wide, at what centres was this service available?
  - (d) What was the total cost of these cards?
  - (e) Is this service still available?
2. What was the total cost of the Identification Card containing a photograph of the said person which were recently supplied to the MLA's?
3. Is any branch or department of the Alberta Government supplying Identification Cards bearing photographs or Identification Cards without photographs to any person or groups of persons in the public service?

If so, what is the total cost of same?

48-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Dr. Hohol, that Question No. 196 be made a motion for return.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

197. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Speaker.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of Agreements between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government for the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area, for the years 1970-71; 1971-72; and 1972-73.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

198. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ruste.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

1. Copies of all correspondence, since September 10, 1971, between the provincial government and the federal government on the topic of equine infectious anaemia.
2. The Alberta Government policy position on this subject.

DR. HORNER:

This is quite agreeable, Mr. Speaker, provided the usual concurrence of the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Subject to the condition mentioned by the hon. Deputy Premier, would all those in favour of No. 198 please say 'aye'? Those opposed please say 'no'.

[The motion was carried subject to that condition.]

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Minister of Advanced Education is not here, I wonder if the member would be agreeable to holding his motion?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that this motion stand over for the time being?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

200. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

List of school building projects that have been approved by the School Buildings Board since September 10th, 1971, including:

1. All new school building projects;
2. All additions to school buildings; and

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-19

3. All school renovations and upgrading.

MR. CLARK:

I would like to move motion No. 200 standing in my name. Might I just add that had this been one or two days later, or the minister's announcement been one or two days earlier, there would have been some additional questions.

[Motion No. 200 was carried without further debate.] [The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

201. Mr. French proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

With regard to The Human Rights Act, Chapter 178, for each of the following years -- 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971

1. the total number of complaints made in writing to the Administrator
  - (a) on fair employment (section 5)
  - (b) on fair accommodation (section 4)
  - (c) on discrimination of accommodation, services or facilities (section 3),
2. the total number of complaints settled,
3. the total number of complaints dismissed,
4. the total number of complaints referred to the Board of Inquiry
  - (a) the number where the Board of Inquiry finds the complaint justified in whole or in part, and
  - (b) the number where the Board of Inquiry does not find the complaint justified.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

202. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Strom.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of all correspondence between the provincial Minister of Agriculture and his department and the federal Minister of Agriculture and his department regarding a commitment from the federal government that funds available for Farm Credit Corporation loans in Alberta will not be adversely affected by the infusion of additional provincial funds in the Alberta Farm Purchase Credit fund.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to Motion 202. The discussions that we have had with the Farm Credit Corporation were held in meetings between the provincial ministers of agriculture and the federal minister of agriculture, and also in direct discussions with the director of the Farm Credit Corporation, and as such, I have no objection to the motion but I doubt very much whether there is anything there to be tabled.

48-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the minister had said so when we were discussing this subject some time ago in this House, I wouldn't have put the Motion on the Order Paper. It was his suggestion, as a result of the matter coming up during debate, and I asked for the information that if I would put it on the Order Paper he would be glad to provide it. And now we hear him standing up and giving a different type of a wishy-washy nonsense. I think there are other things to do in here than to play fun and games of that sort.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not what I suggested he put on the Order Paper. If the hon. member would listen a little more closely then the notices of motion that he draws up might be more accurate and more useful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

I will be pleased to check the transcript because very definitely we were talking about correspondence between the provincial and the federal government relative to the implications on Farm Credit Corporation funding in Alberta as a result of an increase in the funds available under the Farm Purchase Credit Act. And the minister said, oh yes, it was discussed with Ottawa, with the minister, and there was no problem. So I would be pleased to check the transcript on it and find out what type of an evasive answer he gave or didn't give.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to indicate what should happen to the motion in the meantime?

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to suggest Mr. Speaker, that we hold the motion on the Order Paper until I check the transcript.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are agreeable to the motion. I just said that I didn't think there was any correspondence. If there is some we will table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried without further debate or dissent.]

203. Mr. Cooper proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Mandeville.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

1. A list of each school jurisdiction in the province that has vacant classrooms, showing
  - (a) the location of each vacant classroom; and

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-21

(b) the date of construction and the date of last usage of each vacant classroom.

2. A breakdown by school jurisdictions of the 600 portable units in the province.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, this motion does present some difficulties which I have discussed with the hon. mover, the Member for Vermilion-Viking. Certainly we do have a list of the number of vacant classrooms in each school jurisdiction in the province. This is the result of the survey which I initiated last fall and which resulted in the information as to 800 vacant classrooms. But I find that there is not and has never been in the Department of Education any information regarding the location of each of these vacant classrooms, that is Subparagraph (a) of Paragraph 1, there is no information regarding the dates of construction of individual schools or additions, certainly since 1961, which is the date of the establishment of the School Buildings Board. And there is no information at present available on the date of last usage of each vacant classroom.

Last fall it was indicated to me that it would be perhaps useful for the department to have an inventory of all the information requested in this return, that is detailed inventories to what we have in this province regarding school buildings. Advice given to me is that this would take approximately six to eight months at a cost of approximately \$10,000 and perhaps 20 to 30 students in engineering or architecture to do that. I had arranged to do that but when the budget situation came around I was forced to delete that survey, as being a low priority.

Accordingly, I'm in a position where -- and I mentioned this to the member from Vermilion-Viking -- I shall have to amend the motion as follows:

"that motion 203 be amended by deleting paragraphs (1) and (2) and replacing them with the following:

a list of the number of vacant classrooms in each school jurisdiction in the province."

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any debate on the amendment, which I think, in effect, is a substitute motion?

MR. CLARK:

If I could just ask a question, is the minister saying that the department doesn't have a breakdown of the six hundred portable units, as to which jurisdiction has approximately how many?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Director of the School Buildings Board, just at 1:30 today, he indicated that the only way that information could be secured would be by circulating a questionnaire to all the school jurisdictions in the province, and asking them what portables they have, when they received them, where they are, and how full they are. So this information wouldn't be asked for on the Return, but I'm considering getting it in the future.

[The motion was passed as amended without further debate.]

48-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, on Motion 1, due to the unavoidable absence because of medical reasons of the hon. Member for Cardston, I would request the unanimous approval of the House to hold this motion over to next Tuesday, when I'm sure he'll be back, and keep it at the top of the Order Paper.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the Chair correct in assuming that there is unanimous agreement of the House to the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I'd like to thank the members very much.

Standardization of School Design

Moved by Mr. Purdy, seconded by Mr. Farran, adjourned by Mr. Taylor:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to establishing procedures that will result in greater standardization of school design and bulk purchase of school building materials to reduce construction and operating costs.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two in connection with the resolution in question. While the discussion, days ago when this resolution was first brought in, ranged the whole gamut of education, I want to confine my remarks today to the actual matter of standardization of school design and bulk purchasing of school building materials, at least to the greatest possible degree.

Since this resolution was debated the other day, the hon. Minister of Education has advised the House and the people of the province that there is now a general freeze on new school buildings in the province. I take it from the announcement that this doesn't mean that there will be no new schools built during the next five years, but that new schools will be built only where there's a good case made for it, and where there are no vacant classrooms.

If that is the interpretation -- and I believe it is -- then I can certainly support that type of thinking. The school building freeze, however, doesn't really change the context, or the intention of the resolution as I read it, because the resolution is not asking that more schools be built, it's asking that where schools are built, that there be greater standardization of design in the first place.

I believe there is a lot of good sense in this. I'm not sure that we can afford in this province, or in any other province, for that matter, a complete new design for every school building that has to be constructed. This is nice, if we can afford it, but I don't think it's essential. While our teachers and our boys and girls

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-23

require good classrooms, in my view we don't need gold knobs on the doors and we don't need a lot of extravagant buildings.

The three R's and the science and the mathematics, etc., can be taught just as well in a well-built ordinary classroom as it can be taught in a luxuriously, extravagantly, built classroom or school. I believe this is what the taxpayers, generally, in the province think. Certainly that's their thinking in my particular riding. People want good sound schools and schools where the job can be done, but they don't want extravagance and they want them built at the lowest possible cost.

I realize that in the standard design that we are interfering to some degree with the architects or those who draw the blueprints -- those who create out of their own minds the type of schools they would like to see built. And having done that the architect has some right to that particular plan. I don't think any of us would want to deny an architect his proper and just rights. But by the same token, when a good design has been approved, then I would not think it would be impossible to make the proper necessary arrangements with the owner of that design, for its use in many places or in all places where it's applicable, throughout the province. Being fair to the man who created the blueprint and being fair to the taxpayer who has to pay the total bill.

I think there's much to be said for the standardization of school design. I know, also, that many people who give lip service to a standard design do not want to practice a standard design except in somebody else's area. When the matter of standard designs for hospitals was discussed a few years ago, I found no one who couldn't agree that the standard design for a good hospital was excellent, but I know of very few areas -- I do know of one -- but I know of very few areas, including my own, where when it came right down to the decision to have a standard design it was actually accepted. Because it was felt there were other things there that the doctors wanted, that the board wanted, that the patients wanted, and so on. They wanted something unique and something original and something different in their own particular hospital. We'll find the same thing in schools.

I think a standard design will save the taxpayers money. And if we're ever going to accomplish this it's going to be necessary for the government and, particularly, the hon. Minister of Education to, first of all, secure a design that, generally, meets the needs of education in the province, and then make the necessary arrangements to be fair to whoever produced that design, and then pretty well say to school boards, "This is the standard design."

I don't think the hon. Minister of Education will be able to usurp local autonomy and say, "You must use this design." But I do think the Minister of Education and his people can carry the judgment of ninety per cent of the trustees of the province if the design will meet the needs of that particular school. Because most school trustees are aware of the high costs of education; they are closer to the people even than we at the provincial level, and they want to save money in the building of schools. So I think there's much to be said in the department pursuing a standardization of school design.

Perhaps there has to be more than one. It may well be that there's a number of school designs that could become the standard. A standard for a small high school; a standard for a very large high school; a standard for an intermediate school; a standard for an elementary school. All of these have different requirements, both from the teaching point of view, from the pupil point of view. A number of standard designs, I think, could be very advantageous to the people in the province.

48-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

There is one other point I would like to mention in connection with this standardization of design. Too many of us think that when we build a school -- let me put it this way -- that every time we build a school we have to have everything in it. Many of our areas could very usefully use one good gymnasium, and one good concert hall, and one good swimming pool. I am not averse to putting these in our schools. As a matter of fact, I think it is the most sensible place in which put a gym for an area -- in the school, where it will be used daytime and nighttime, and weekends and holidays. That should be a principle that is enunciated before the thing is actually built. But many of our towns, and even our cities, today, have gymnasiums that are being used a few hours every day of the weekday only. They are not being used in the evenings at all, and many hours of the day they are not being used either. I think this is a waste that the taxpayer could well do without.

I cannot see too much difficulty in a town of 1,500 or 2,000 people, even though they have two or three schools where they couldn't have one gymnasium built in one of those schools, where they couldn't have one inside pool built in one of those schools, and have one good concert hall built in one of those schools without having the same thing done in every one of the schools. Examples of this can be found in the province today.

The number of classrooms, I think, is a different matter. I personally believe that, in planning a school, a standardization design would have to give some consideration to the number of grades and the number of boys and girls who are going to attend that school -- whether it is for the elementary, the intermediate, or the high school. I think those facts would have to be made known to the architect.

Then if the school board did want to have a design for a small high school that would accommodate 200 students, it would simply be a matter of producing that common design, and saying, "after a lot of consideration, this is what we think meets the major requirements of a small high school in the province." Well, I think we would undoubtedly save money if we did attack this and did more planning in the standardization of school design.

When it comes to the bulk purchase of school building materials, I think we have to be fairly careful again, to guard the local autonomy. Otherwise, it may become an item of very large monopoly purchasing, to the detriment of scores of businesses in the province and in smaller centres, and in decentralized areas, without actually saving much, when you consider the final cost. If we are going to have bulk purchasing in the metropolitan areas, or in two areas, north and south, or in three areas, north and south and far north, in the province, with those items delivered to one place, you must then consider the assortment, the storage, and the freight, and the haulage to the site of the particular school. I think any consideration in bulk purchase of school building materials should be very, very carefully thought out and worked on the basis of the total final cost, rather than just the bid price on the materials themselves.

There is another item, I think, that comes into this matter in regard to school buildings. That is the matter of building schools, or moving schools, today. There are areas -- and this information will likely be much more readily available when the answer to Question No. 203 Return is tabled in the House -- there are schools in the province, and empty classrooms in the province. Undoubtedly, there are empty classrooms in some of our major cities. At the same time we are building new school buildings. I believe the big difficulty is in getting, moving, the schools to where the boys and girls are, or of moving the boys and girls to where the schools are. And one or the other has to take place if we are to make use of vacant classrooms.



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-25

Then again we have to start assessing the costs. Maybe the difference in the costs of moving boys and girls to empty classrooms and renovating those classrooms, or of moving the empty classrooms to the areas of high population and then renovating the school in the new site, isn't going to save the taxpayer very much money, or in some cases any money. Because again you have to take the final cost, not the cost that is apparent only in the busing, or only in the fact that we have a school room built. The renovation costs have to be taken into consideration if they are moving them; foundations and possible cracking of part of the structure, re-plastering, etc. etc. In some cases, by doing this the cost to the taxpayer has actually been more or equal to the square foot cost of building a brand new structure.

So again, I want to express a word of caution that before we do these types of things, we have some very careful assessment made of what the final cost is going to be. I emphasize final cost because I think that is a very important item. I don't think there is any blanket answer to this particular problem. I think in many cases it is going to have to be considered on the merits of the particular problem at hand and the decision made based on the assessment made at that time.

There are two other points I would like to mention that are related to the resolution. There are many cases today and over the past few years where industries have folded up and where schools have suddenly become empty because families have moved away, or in some cases where school boards have centralized and bused all the boys and girls from a certain hamlet. There has been left the school grounds and the school building. From the cases that I have seen, the sale of such school buildings only brings in a song, really a very small pittance compared to the original cost of that school, because the person or company buying it must move it off the grounds and so on.

There was a case in Drumheller Valley regarding the people of the Midlandvale area, where the school was closed and the boys and girls were taken into the City of Drumheller, where the school board had made a decision to sell the buildings and to subdivide the school lot. The people of the area, I think, showed real vision when they said this is a part of a public works reserve, why do we want to get a few dollars now out of the sale of this building and in subdividing the lots, and then a few years down the road have to spend very large sums of money for a recreational area? The people brought the matter to my attention as the MLA and we arranged meetings with the school board and discussed this -- with the result that that area was made available to the recreational society of that community. It is now up to the community to show that it can be used to good advantage, that the building can be used for community and recreational purposes. They already have a skating rink on it and a soft ball diamond and they have other plans. The idea of using these schools, particularly in populated areas, I think is a very excellent one and should be used to a greater degree for recreational purposes.

When it was my pleasure to represent the Canadian Government in Central America at the opening of the Pan-American Highway, one of the things that appealed to me in all of those large cities wasn't the amount of poverty that I saw and the extreme riches and the extreme extravagance as compared to the extreme poverty. That was certainly noticeable. But one of the things that was even more noticeable and conspicuous than that was that in all of those cities, they had beautiful parks in the centre of their cities. They didn't take every square foot and sell it for commercial purposes. They had enough vision to realize that they wanted an area in the heart of their city where people could enjoy themselves, where people could sit down and enjoy the atmosphere, where they could build statues to commemorate their past and where their boys and girls could play their games.

48-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

I was amazed at how far ahead the people of those central American countries are, which we think are backward -- and they are backward in many respects -- but they are far ahead of us when it comes to making sure they keep areas in their populated areas away from commercialism, and they are for recreation and the enjoyment of the people.

We need to follow that example greatly in this particular country. I would urge that when schools do become empty, and there is a possibility of using that school for other purposes -- recreational, community -- and those grounds for other public purposes, that that have first priority. I would like to see that written into the law, because I consider it so important. Too often the dollar bill takes the spotlight and we can't afford to lose these dollar bills even though they are only a pittance compared to the original cost of the building, or a pittance compared to the potential cost of the land.

The other point that I'd like to mention briefly is the matter of planning. I believe that it doesn't matter how much planning you do, if you build a school in an area where there is an industry and the industry for some reason folds up, and everybody moves away, you are then left with a school and the grounds and that investment to a large degree is lost. I don't suppose any amount of planning can change that. No one could have guessed a few years ago, when they built a beautiful school in the hamlet of Wayne where there were more than 1,000 people, where there was a thriving business section, where the mining industry was going full blast -- no one could have thought then that within a relatively few years it would be nothing but a ghost town. But that's what happened. Had anybody suggested they couldn't have a school in those days, there probably would have been a revolution among those miners. I don't think you can plan for that type of thing, but there are many cases where planning can be done that will put the school in a place where it's going to be useful and used for many, many years to come. I think planning should form a very important part in the building of our schools.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, as a member of a town school board for some 24 years, with an additional five years served on the school division board representing that town, but chiefly as a member of the Legislature representing a rural constituency, I would like to make a few remarks on this two-pronged motion.

Firstly, standardization of school design is nothing very new. It's been advocated and even tried over the years. As a matter of fact, if you go back to the first schools in Alberta, those one-roomed rural schools, they were of a standardized design. When a new school district was formed, a board was usually given the choice of a cottage style school, or the gable-roofed school, the plans of which they could get from the Department of Education. Of course, as I say this was the most simple example of architecture. I merely mentioned this to indicate that standardization of plans goes back a long, long way.

The board of which I was a member for so many years considered adopting a standard design in order to save money, for a small four-roomed primary school. We examined some plans which we procured from the Department of Education, but no plan they had quite seemed to meet our needs. They all needed some changes in them, and of course, we didn't have the ability to do that ourselves and it meant the engagement of an architect. We found out, too, that in adopting such a plan we would have no architect there for supervision. Then again, specifications were rather sketchy. In short, we lacked much needed information that we should have had, that we needed, and so we gave up the idea. However, I have no particular objection to standardization of school plans.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-27

It's the second prong in the motion to which I am really opposed. It is alright for a city member to advocate bulk buying of materials, because the big city dealers would grab all the bulk orders, leaving nothing for the towns in which I am particularly interested.

This means that the building supply dealers in towns and villages in rural Alberta would be left out in the cold. It is in these areas in which many of the schools would be built. They wouldn't profit in the least from the building of these schools. It is in the survival of these centres that many of us here are greatly concerned; so concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Industry has a \$50 million Alberta Opportunity Fund Act before the Legislature. I congratulate him for it. This is designed to bolster the economy of Alberta's towns and Alberta's villages. This motion, if passed and acted upon, would take away possible opportunities for these rural businessmen.

Recently in Vermilion, Mr. Speaker, there have been two large additions built to schools. The total amount spent was a little in excess of \$800,000. There are two large lumber yards there and building supply houses. Both of these were given the opportunity to tender on much of the building materials. If we had bulk buying of materials in effect, they wouldn't have been given that opportunity. Besides these opportunities, lumber yard managers inform me that when buildings of this size are built in the community, although some bulk materials might be brought in from outside, the local yards still are called upon to supply quite a variety of materials, and benefit greatly in a business way.

All this adds Mr. Speaker, to the economy and prosperity of rural towns and villages; and would be lost to rural Alberta if a plan of bulk buying of school building materials was embarked upon. I would possibly go along with the first prong of this motion; but I am certainly decidedly opposed to bulk buying of materials which would be a blow to business in towns and villages. I hope all rural members will vote against this motion.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments because of the last two speakers. I don't think this will resolve itself into a rural-city vote because the Edmonton Public School Board took a very close look at bulk buying with other urban boards -- the four urban boards in the province -- and we found that this was going to be a pretty costly proposition in the cities also. One of the problems was that the shipments would be made to a central location in one of the cities. Distribution to the school boards would be from that point. The implications to staff to transport units became pretty clear. The increased costs of the delivery system were such that we had to abandon our intent to proceed that way. There was a feasibility study that showed that what you say about the country holds true for the city.

The comments with respect to design are difficult to oppose. Within the constraints and limits that were so well put by the hon. Members for Olds-Didsbury and Lethbridge in the first discussion, and the hon. Member for Drumheller, of soil and temperature, of the size and the number of children, the location in the province, the geography of the place -- within these constraints because they do affect design -- responsible stewardship in the matter of school buildings would require close attempts at common design. I think responsible school boards are doing this kind of thing at the present time. So I would support it on that basis.

48-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Member for Stony Plain still wish to close the debate? May the hon. Member for Stony Plain close the debate?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an intriguing comment if you would let me. The point is simply this; as a challenge to the architects and the school people, advisors and the minister's office and so on we speak about the kind of thing that happened in the constituency of the hon. Member for Drumheller. This happens in the cities constantly, where growth of the population drops off leaving an empty school building and they usually go at a very little price to a buyer or left to vandalism.

We have not much difficulty making additions to schools. What school people have to look at very seriously is the demounting of units well, so build a school -- I know this is not a new idea -- I recall the prior minister talking in these terms years ago. What I am saying is that we have to learn how to build schools so that as populations drop off, certain educational services, whether they are in vocational education or what -- I'm not suggesting that this is a case in point -- become obsolete, programs that we will no longer offer, these can be demounted and moved elsewhere with only transportation and maybe some kind of obsolescence cost. As we learn how to add to a school building, then I suggest that we have to learn how to demount them and take them where the population is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Now may the hon. Member for Stony Plain close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. PURDY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to first of all thank all hon. members that participated in this debate. I think there were a lot of good points brought out, and the most significant one that I can see is the idea of greater use of schools and the flexibility of school buildings themselves. Another point that was brought out was uniform fire safety regulations and more co-ordination between the school boards and fire commissioners' offices.

Today the hon. Member for Drumheller made a few comments and most of them were well taken. He was talking about moving schools. I think this is where portable units come into play. They are used quite extensively in the province, and in fact, we have 600 of them that are vacant at the present time. Then he also spoke about the design that would be taken away from the local autonomy if we only had one design. But I think the design should be available to local autonomy if they needed it and required it there, at no extra cost to them.

There is not much else that I want to say on closing the debate except that I would like to read into the record, and this is from April 10, 1957 and it was moved by Mr. McLaughlin, hon. Member for Stony Plain.

"Whereas the ever increasing costs involved in school construction are largely controlled beyond the control of local school boards. And whereas the provisions of the Architect's Act, requiring the services of a registered architect for all schools of three rooms or more, or having an auditorium or

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-29

gymnasium add a cost factor which might be reduced or eliminated.

Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to making available to school boards a number of approved and standard plans for school buildings.

And further that the Government give serious consideration to the introduction of legislation which will enable school boards to adopt a standard plan approved by the Department of Education with or without the services of a registered architect."

And this was I say, back in 1957.

The hon. Mr. Manning made the following statement with respect to the motion. "The government concurs with this resolution". And it was carried.

I believe some of it has been done in the province, but I still feel it hasn't had wide expansion as it should have. So I would ask all members to support this resolution.

[The motion was carried without further debate.]

#### Provincial Parks in Cities

Moved by Mr. Farran: seconded by Mr. Chichak.

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta consider the establishment of Provincial Parks in Calgary and Edmonton, and other cities.

The following amendment was proposed by Mr. Drain; seconded by Mr. Notley:

That the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the words "and in towns".

Debate on the amendment was adjourned by Mr. Cooper.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, speaking briefly to the amendment; this motion, as all the members have probably realized, has been completely defused as far as debatability is concerned. It's been built up in its demands and watered down in its debatability. If passed, and if possible to carry it out, every member in the legislature would have a park or two in his constituency, in his town, so if everyone gets a prize, just what is there to debate?

The motion started off with a park for each of the two major cities -- two parks -- and this really provided the basis for what could have been a good, lively debate -- rural versus urban.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. COOPER:

So the motion started with two parks for the big cities, increased to ten parks as all the cities in Alberta were included; then to 112 parks when all of Alberta's 102 towns were included by the amendment.

Now, throw in the 51 provincial parks we already have in existence, and we would have 163 provincial parks for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests to develop and to maintain; 163

48-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

provincial parks, Mr. Speaker. This would certainly provide the hon. Premier ample cause to appoint still another Minister without Portfolio in charge of provincial parks.

Consider, too, the fact that the budget of the Department of Lands and Forests has been slashed considerably, thus the parks requested in the amendment and the motion are certainly out of reach for many years to come.

The reduction, Mr. Speaker, in the Lands and Forests budget, especially as regards provincial parks, puzzles me considerably. We hear much of a team of 48 members to promote tourism -- the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in Charge of Tourism has been appointed -- while at the same time the budget for the very factors that attract tourists -- provincial parks, the big attractions -- is being drastically reduced.

So here we see one driver of a team of 58 members over there whipping up his horses and getting away to a good start, but this driver of the team over here, the "Minister in charge of Provincial Parks" has his tugs all mixed up and he's backing up.

I certainly intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote in favour of the amendment, and the motion as amended, as I would certainly be very selfish if I didn't do so, because I am possibly the one member in the Legislature who does have a provincial park on his front doorstep. I know just what it means to the people in the town to have such a park. The boundaries of the town of Vermilion coincide with those of the Vermilion Provincial Park, in which there is a nice lake, beach, playgrounds for the children, all sorts of camping facilities, camp kitchens, and it is easily accessible for every person in the town. On summer afternoons and evenings, hundreds of town people simply move from the town down to the park, swim, sun bathe on the sandy beach, boat, picnic. So I know from observation, and from experience, and participation, that these parks are certainly desirable, certainly needed.

It is certainly regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that all things physically possible and desirable are not financially possible.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise and say a few words, not only on the amendment but on the matter of towns and the provincial parks themselves. I think it has been amply demonstrated by those who have spoken on this motion so far that there is the need for more parks -- particularly when we consider that our society is going to have more recreation time, and there are not that many places for recreation, and the number of people who are going to use these parks and the areas which they are going to draw from. I'm concerned about the parks in the two large cities. While we don't live in a large city, I believe that a provincial park is a great need, probably serving a greater need in the metropolitan cities than it does in the rural areas, simply and solely because the parks they have existing in the city are, in a sense, not parks as we would define a provincial park. Many of them are very elaborate and they are, in a sense, more of an elaborate garden than what we would call a park.

To me a provincial park is a place where we not only have the amenities such as camp kitchens and toilet facilities and the like, but is also a place that is, in a sense, nature in the raw. They are also places where children can play; young people can hike, if the park is a fair size; they are places that go over and beyond what we would call the normal parks that are within our metropolitan areas.

One of the reasons we should have such parks, particularly in these two large cities, as mentioned before, is for the poorer people

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-31

who cannot afford, say, an automobile. Many of them who don't get out of the major city more than once during the year have no other place to go but sitting in these small, elaborate parks. You can take the grounds around the provincial building here as an example, surely it is not a park or considered as a park. It is a large garden, a beautiful garden, and this is the only opportunity that many of these people have to get out into the country to a park or a provincial park. To get out beyond the city border, or if it's adjacent to the city, where bus service is provided as was already mentioned. These people could at least get out from the hustle and the bustle of the city and get out with their families and enjoy a relaxing and a healthful afternoon or evening.

As far as the large cities are concerned, I believe this burden is too heavy for them. They have a large capital outlay, not only for their own parks system, but to amass the amount of land that would be needed for a city the size of Edmonton or the size of Calgary, at this time is beyond municipal capacity, the economic capacity of these two cities. To provide such a park, you're looking at an amount of money at least from \$3 million to \$4 million.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to give a novel idea -- and I'm not concerned now with the City of Edmonton, I'm just concerned about the City of Calgary -- and in 1975 Calgary celebrates its 100th anniversary. In 1974, one year before, my own community celebrates its 100th anniversary. Now these communities, in 1874 and 1875, were small outposts of civilization and of law and order. These small outposts went through many years of hardships. They were growth areas and centres from which the whole province and southern Alberta -- when you take southern Alberta from Red Deer south -- were areas in which growth spread to all parts of that part of the province. They are going to celebrate the giving of much to public service and providing much in the public domain.

If we look at these two areas, and one of course is much larger than the other, and if we think of the social and the cultural activities they have provided for the communities over the 100 years -- the hospitals, the schools, the commerce, the sports -- everything that they have provided, and the nucleus that they have provided to southern Alberta over the years, I believe the province and the people of this province owe these communities a great debt. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we should make a contribution to these communities and I am suggesting today that the province or the government should look at the possibility of providing a \$10 per capita grant to those communities, and as communities in this province become 100 years old, they provide also the same \$10 per capita grant. This \$10 per capita grant could be used in the form of a park, or the proceeds used to amass the land and to initiate the capital outlay to provide a provincial park.

These communities, then, would be responsible for the maintenance and the future expansion, as their needs and desires should be. We are looking at, then, for the City of Calgary, in the neighbourhood of \$3.5 million. I do not think this is a large sum, when we consider what could be done with \$3.5 million in building a provincial park, or a concept of a provincial park. For my own community, we are looking at something like \$28,000, allowing that our population is 2,800.

I believe that, when we are talking about parks, how many communities are going to celebrate their 100th anniversary within the next ten years? You can count them on the fingers of one hand. We have communities today that have barely celebrated their 50th anniversary. We had the roses here the other day, from the town of Redcliff, which is just celebrating its 60th anniversary. So you still have 40 years to go. You have other communities that are only celebrating their 75th, and so on and so forth.

48-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

So, if you were to take the total today, within the next 50 years, if our population doubled, we are looking at something like \$30 million which over a period of that many years is not a large sum. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the need for parks, the need for recreation facilities, is going to be paramount for the coming generation. I would like to see that the City of Calgary -- I believe that the province, as I mentioned before, owes the City of Calgary a debt of gratitude for the part that they have played in the last 100 years in the development of this great province of ours.

I believe also, that in my own community, while it is only 2,800, it probably hasn't grown in the last 100 years -- it is bigger now probably than it ever was -- it was the major outpost at that time. If we think -- and it is probably not as apparent in Calgary as it is, maybe, in a small community -- the records of the church, the records of the municipality, the records of the hospital, in these communities, the number of people that were born there, the number of people that came there and were married and fanned out to settle the other parts of the province -- that we owe a debt to these communities. Rather than say, "well, let us develop these parks all over the province, all at once." I know we cannot do it. But I believe that we could do it on this idea of when they reached their 100th anniversary, that the province provide the money, so that we have an anniversary present that is useful for all the people. We could turn around and say, "well, if you have a park, and you do not need one, the money can be used for some other community service, but it would have to receive the blessing of the provincial government."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this would not only take in towns, and small cities, but it would also serve to take in the two major cities.

I would therefore suggest that the amendments, the sub-amendments, and the Resolution itself, are all in order as far as my suggestion is concerned.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to take part in the debate on the amendment to the motion. I want to point out that at the beginning, when this motion was proposed, that I took very strong exception to the fact that there was what appeared to me, from the motion and from the remarks made, to be a sort of ward approach to the problem. Although I was criticised shortly thereafter, the judgment exercised at that time was substantiated by the fact that the motion was changed to what I am very pleased now to support.

I am rather impressed with the remarks of the hon. Member for MacLeod because the precedent of making per capita grants for recreational purposes and other purposes in this province has been established by the Social Credit government, has been very well received throughout the province, and has had very lasting benefits to the majority of the people of the province. I support that concept.

I will, at the risk of being accused of being partisan or parochial or displaying a ward attitude, as I have criticized others of doing, state that the two cities of Edmonton and Calgary are finding out now how expensive it is to build parks within the city limits after decades of poor planning and building up solidly in areas where some common sense might have provided open spaces.

I do not go along with arguments of council members, particularly, that our land is very expensive. I know it costs money, but when you go to Britain or parts of Europe where the population is very, very heavy they have provided ample and beautiful parks. And here in this province with a population of 1.5 million, our cities are crowded badly. There are millions of acres of prairie



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-33

and park land, but we have concentrated building shoulder to shoulder, as it were, and we have concrete jungles. Perhaps the provincial government is partly to blame; you also have to blame the council and planning boards, the planning bodies of these two cities.

When the hon. members are debating so strongly in favour of park areas in Calgary and Edmonton, I support them. But they should also stand up and be counted when authorities, provincial or local, erode or encroach upon what open spaces there are now. I would like to see the Edmonton members stand up and be counted when they want to build up highrise buildings, offices, government offices, or private buildings in the area directly north of the Legislative Building. It's next to being sacred ground. I know that the civil service will have grandiose plans for having a compact government area, but that acre or two of land north of here can become a very beautiful and meaningful park. So it isn't enough merely to ask the provincial government to do something for you, you have to stand up and defend those areas against encroachment by construction, those areas that are now open spaces.

The same thing can apply to Calgary. I had the pleasure of building what is called a mini-park in Calgary at a tremendous cost to the people of this province, but I think it is worthwhile. There are some who may criticize the size of the park but there was no alternative to the space available. We started something that ought to be carried through and supported not only by MLA's, but perhaps by local members, by council members, and the people. Instead of rebuilding government buildings, or institutional buildings, or private buildings that are being torn down within city limits in concentrated construction areas, a very determined bid ought to be made to create more park land.

I am saying this, bearing in mind that it has been well established in this House that we, in Alberta, perhaps have more park areas in the whole province than any other province in Canada, perhaps any state in the United States. In fact, we have millions of acres of wilderness that will remain a wilderness no matter whether we designate it as such or not, because of inaccessibility or that the land is not of any commercial use, at least not in the foreseeable future. So we are endowed rather well with prairies, wilderness, rivers, lakes, and mountains and what have you, but the majority of the people still live in the cities, and I would say that a ten acre park within a city or within a large town would probably have more people visit it during the day or the week or the summer, than perhaps a 10,000 acre wilderness that is inaccessible. So the accent has to be placed on providing parks and park areas in the cities, but as I have stated, it behooves all those MLA's who represent cities and large towns and smaller cities, to stand up and be counted and defend the very things that they are proposing the government do now.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I very strongly support the concept of a per capita grant, in the interest of fair play to everybody. There's nothing better than starting with a centennial year of some major centre. A per capita grant of \$10 or so would enable many projects to get off the ground, and perhaps steer the people in the right direction so far as park areas and recreational areas are concerned.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government ought to take a lead in this respect and not expect to build large institutional buildings in areas close to a place like this building we are in today, or in concentrated areas in cities of Edmonton and Calgary, Lethbridge and Red Deer, and others, but to move away from the centre of heavy traffic and heavy construction and make it possible for vacant lots and acreages to be preserved for parks for the use of the people.

48-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

I have in mind a couple of projects that were started in Calgary, and were supported by government help, namely Princess Island and St. George's Island, and I'm of the opinion that these two small areas attract more people in a summer than perhaps some of our national parks in the case of the number of . . .

MR. FARRAN:

Unless my memory is at fault, I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is speaking twice on this motion.

MR. TAYLOR:

He's speaking on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is speaking, I take it, on the amendment.

MR. FARRAN:

[Inaudible comment.]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member, if he did have a valid objection, woke up too late. I'm virtually finished. All I have to tell Mr. Farran is -- it's not when you get up, it's when you wake up that counts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, on a matter of relevancy on this particular motion, it is very similar. The amendment that is before the House at the present time has my whole-hearted support, and I hope the support of all the hon. members in the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc won that tie.

MR. HENDERSON:

I'm going to be mercifully brief, Mr. Speaker, as usual. I would like to rise in my place and speak against the amendment.

Being a representative of a constituency which joins the City of Edmonton, and one in which there are a number of municipal parks, either in towns or in the rural area, the one difficulty is that the residents of the district find themselves literally squeezed out of the parks by the visitors from the large community of Edmonton. I quite frankly would suggest that the need for a park area in this province is indeed in close proximity to the City of Calgary and the City of Edmonton, primarily. There may be some other medium-sized cities where there is a good argument in favour of it. But notwithstanding the fact that I have eight or nine small towns in my community, I can't, with any degree of logic, accept the proposition of the amendment in towns. I just don't see the priority in that regard. In fact, I think in voting in favour of the amendment, I would be actually working against the better interests of the towns that I do have in my constituency. The smaller parks, in spreading the resources available throughout the province, are not going to benefit the people in the two larger communities which find themselves somewhat removed from these facilities.

I'd just like to suggest to the government that in the event that they do take the motion seriously, at least within the vicinity of the City of Edmonton, that they give very careful consideration to the propositions of restoring the water levels in the Cooking Lake-

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-35

Miguelon Lake trend, with a view of reacquiring public title to a substantial portion of the lands adjacent to them, and creating indeed a very attractive, sizeable provincial park in close proximity to the City of Edmonton.

A second alternative I think in the vicinity of Edmonton and somewhat further afield, would fit very well in demonstrating to the citizens of the province the fact that coal mining doesn't lead to complete devastation of the environment. I would like to suggest the hon. Minister of the Environment take a look at the feasibility once the mining operations in a given area near Lake Wabamun are completed and the land has been reclaimed, of the government looking to acquiring title to the land and converting it into a park. I think it would make an excellent demonstration project to the people of the province, that these resources can be utilized; the land can be effectively reclaimed; and so far as its value for recreational purpose, if it is done properly and is well-planned over a long period of time, it can enhance the recreational value of the lands in question.

MR. FARRAN:

[Inaudible comment.]

MR. HENDERSON:

If it is the wish of the hon. mover of the motion, I would be more than pleased to do so.

MR. FARRAN:

. . . otherwise it is going to be talked out and never come up again, so I move we close debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The reasoning of the hon. member is unknown to me and I don't think it is known to the Rules.

MR. FARRAN:

Am I not correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying, if this isn't brought to a conclusion by 4:30, we proceed to the rest of the Order Paper, it will go to the bottom of the Order Paper and is unlikely to come up again in this session?

MR. SPEAKER:

That may happen but there is no provision in the Rules which --

MR. FARRAN:

In the Rules, isn't a motion to put the question an order? -- the previous question?

MR. SPEAKER:

On the moving the previous question as I understand the Rules, the debate continues without amendment. And the previous question may not be moved after an amendment has been moved.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I feel a bit like I am in a park here. Every time the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill goes down I go up; every time I go down he comes up; it is like a teeter-totter.

48-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

Just a few comments here on parks. There are a number of novel ideas being thrown out this afternoon and in the previous debate on this particular motion, and the amendment to the motion. I will speak particularly about the City of Edmonton and leave the other cities alone. I agree with the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc that the extension of the motion 'to towns' would basically reduce the effect and value of the motion.

With respect to the city of Edmonton we have a number of problems, all dealing with growth. We find in the city of Edmonton a constant outward expansion, constant annexations and constant movement out of the city boundaries. We find at the same time there is a growing demand for a green belt surrounding the city of Edmonton, within which no development would take place. Perhaps this motion can somehow be directed toward that end. We find in the city of Edmonton a requirement for a ring road, a requirement for more parks, a requirement for a green belt. Perhaps the three could somehow be brought together under one particular plan and we could end up with the three in conjunction with the motion we are discussing this afternoon.

In the city of Edmonton we have a lot of miniature parks, particularly because of the location of the river valley and various ravines and creeks running to it. So I think we shouldn't be looking at the miniature park nor the formal park in connection with a motion of this nature. What we should be looking at is a more substantial park; one in which people can stretch their legs and get moving; take out their horses; get on their bikes.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is 4:30. Perhaps if the one whose bill appears next on the Order Paper would prefer to proceed with that bill I could move to adjourn debate. However, if it is the wish of the House that I continue, I can continue with my contribution.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

I have no objections, if this is the last member who wishes to speak to it, to finish the debate and deal with the motion if that is the wish of House. I have no objection.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the members that wish to speak on this motion --

MR. SPEAKER:

It would require the unanimous consent of the House, and presumably that would mean no further speakers. Perhaps the quickest way to deal with it would be to ask, are there hon. members, would they please say no, who do not wish the debate to continue beyond the prescribed time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-37

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill No 205: An Act to amend The Social Development Act

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the reluctance of the hon. members seated opposite to allow one of their own motions to come to a vote, I am pleased to proceed with the debate on Bill No. 205. I had mentioned this subject in the House earlier in the session, that I intended to introduce a bill and the bill was placed before the House some time ago.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting the bill, I would like to make it very plain that I don't wish it to be taken as a indication of any suggestion that there are not indeed many instances where payment of public assistance is indeed justified and desirable. In fact, it would be unjust in cases of legitimate need when we live in such a land of plenty not to see that the material needs of our fellow citizens are met, when they find themselves in circumstances where they legitimately are unable to look after themselves.

There has been a dramatic change in the attitudes towards public assistance in this country as a whole, not only Alberta but Canada in general, over the last three or four decades, and certainly those which existed in my recollections of the thirties. It was then a question of a very rare privilege for anyone to get welfare assistance, and in most cases it was somebody borrowing from his neighbour. The government wasn't involved in it. If anyone was involved in it on an organized basis it was a church group. From there we have gone on to the present state of affairs where, to my way of interpretation, we see that it is enshrined in federal government legislation or at least in policy, with the question of welfare being now a right. It is not a matter of a question of privilege in need, it is a matter of right, and I think when we look at the trends in society relating to the welfare field as well as the expansion and the purpose and intent of the Unemployment Insurance legislation that has taken place in recent years, one cannot but become increasingly concerned as to where this trend is going to lead us.

Certainly in my view, this country was built by individuals who were acting responsibly. Society was built as a result of individual efforts and individual enterprise. I agree, society can carry a certain number of people and not see its social values seriously affected. And I point out that even if one in ten persons chooses not to work -- and I say chooses not to work, but rather live off public assistance, live off public money -- our society may tolerate it. Because for every one who is not working, there is still nine who are, if you want to put it that way. But the ratio changes very dramatically as soon as that number rises to two, because the ratio drops down from 9/1 to 5/1. I suggest that a democratic society such as ours, is founded in a sense and to a high degree on a very developed and strong sense of individual responsibility. While the abuses that might take place in the system at the present time may be comparatively small in number, certainly the impression I get, and the complaints I get from constituents, are that the numbers are growing in frequency.

I have, for example, a setter in my pocket, which I received from a constituent who lives near the city, who runs a dairy farm. They are completely unable to comprehend public policy where taxpayers' money is being used to create make-work programs because of the supposed unemployment in the country, and other measures are being taken -- reduced corporation taxes, presumably to stimulate the economy, to create employment opportunities.

48-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

Then, on the other hand, many people in that type of business simply find themselves unable to get labour to carry on the operations of their farm, or any other type of small business. Not only are they unable to acquire the labour, by virtue of the inability to find people who want to work, but they also are amazed at the fact that government, by force of law, takes their hard-earned money away from them and turns a portion of it over to hand out to those who do not wish to work. There's a very sharp distinction between those who can't or are not able and those who will not.

I recall too in my own constituency, last year there were farm people trying to get labour for harvesting but they couldn't get people to leave the unemployment insurance roll or leave welfare rolls in order to take on that form of employment. I'm also familiar with my experience in the oil business, where contractors, supposedly in periods of unemployment, couldn't get men to take on employment in the construction industry ... again in the wintertime, and it's not that pleasant a task. In many cases, one had to double up on the number of contractors, and the amount of machinery, simply because one contractor couldn't get enough crews to work around the clock.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that we are heading into an era where notwithstanding all of the best intentions of government to create employment opportunities because of the growing liberality and opinion towards items such as unemployment insurance -- the right of the individual to stay home and collect insurance. If he doesn't want to work, the right of the individual to stay home and collect welfare if he doesn't want to work -- we are entering into an era in this country where we are going to suffer continuously from chronic high unemployment. A lot of it, I suggest is going to be forthcoming from individuals who simply find it in their better interest to stay home and let their fellow taxpayers support them.

The Department of Social Development some time back, in this province, for example, did a study which shows very clearly that -- this is with a view to rehabilitative measures to get unemployed employables off the welfare rolls and back into the labour force -- an individual on welfare, particularly in the larger cities, who had four or more children in the family, could make more money, receive more money out of welfare payments than they could get by working at some form of gainful employment. It was particularly obvious in those cases where the individual was singularly lacking in skills, and found himself mainly working in a field wherein the minimum wage was the basic rate of pay. It might be argued by suggesting that in the case of unemployed employables who are offered work and decline work, under reasonable circumstances, that reducing their social allowance to the amount they would earn under the Minimum Wage Law, may work some hardship in some cases on the families involved.

I am prepared to accept this, but it brings up the question of who is basically responsible for the welfare of that family -- the breadwinner in the family, or that man's fellow taxpayer, friends and neighbours. I have to suggest that sooner or later you reach the point where the individual has to accept -- and his family has to accept -- some of the consequences of his action.

So I think in cases where it can be clearly established by the department that an individual could be working, that employment opportunities are available to him, there is really no legitimate reason why he shouldn't be working, that in such cases where the individual refuses to work, that the government, the department, should have the authority, in its wisdom, on the basis of the circumstances to limit the amount of social development or social assistance payments that would be forthcoming from the department at that time.

I would also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with a policy such as this I think it might do something to alter the shift that

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-39

has taken place in recent years of welfare families from the rural areas into the urban areas. A lot of the attraction of moving into the urban areas is basically because the welfare payments are better if they live in Edmonton than they are out in one of the small towns a hundred miles away from the city. Once again, if there's an unemployed employable involved in the matter, who declines to work, it certainly would not help him out to simply move from one community to another simply because he thought he would get a better deal on welfare when he got there.

In closing I want to state, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding my views on the subject insofar as unemployed employables are concerned, I readily admit that it's a minority of people that are involved in the abuses but it's a minority that's growing. I also suggest to the hon. members, in principle it's the minority which, if they are allowed to grow to any measure, poses some very serious long-range consequences for what we have traditionally considered to be a free democratic society with individual people acting in a responsible manner.

I would, therefore, like to urge the members to support the bill. I would emphasize it doesn't require the minister to do it, it simply says the director 'may' limit, in his wisdom, not with a view of forcing him to act in the matter at all, but simply that if this Legislature were to support the bill that it would provide an indication to the public servants who administer the program that this Legislature endorses this as a basic policy within our society.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it it was inadvertence on the hon. member's part not to have formally moved second reading of his bill and not to have named the seconder?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat enthralled by the exercise that was going on on the previous motion as to whether we were going to finish it or whether we were going to debate it with the hon. members opposite, and I neglected to make the formal motion. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill 205.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should have a seconder -- he is still in trouble.

MR. HENDERSON:

Seconded by the hon. member Mr. Clark.

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order, what's all this about requiring the seconding of a bill -- second reading of a bill -- would the hon. minister give us a citation on it. I would like to hear it.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't have the citation, Mr. Speaker, but it's my understanding that while first reading of a bill does not require a seconder, the second reading is a motion and does require, under the usual rules requiring a motion to be seconded, a seconder.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest you take the matter under advisement. I think it is rather an academic technicality.

48-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

Certainly it hasn't been the practice in this Assembly in previous years but it's somewhat academic to myself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

More red tape now, eh?

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER:

It has never been done before!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is, in fact, a rule of this Assembly which says that each and every motion must be in writing and seconded and we have not followed that, particularly with regard to adjournment.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to speak on this bill, Bill 205, on a number of counts.

It is obvious that it is a premature hurried bill, not taking into account many, many items. As a matter of fact, it is so premature and hurried that I notice it is an Act to Amend The Social Development Act, and I suspect it should read An Act To Amend The Health and Social Development Act.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member would check, he would find his own minister has introduced a similar bill relating to The Social Development Act this session which applies to this act. So I don't think the hon. member for really done his homework and knows what he is talking about.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I still suspect it should be Health and Social Development. However, in either case, the many hurried items -- obviously a hurried bill on the basis that the overall picture of health and social development and welfare incentives have not been taken into consideration. The fact is that welfare recipients have multifactorial causative factors, and the fact is that welfare recipients themselves, even the employable ones, are variable for many, many reasons. There are many, examples of this. Although I can agree in principle that social allowance may equal the minimal wage for unemployed employables who refuse employment in some cases, there is no doubt that there are many other cases and exceptions to this rule that would have to be brought into the act. There is, for example, the father of a large family with special problems, he undoubtedly would require more money; the single unemployed parent, and so forth.

Now, the hon. member, of all members, who was involved with the Department of Health in the previous administration, surely knows that there are even many other reasons and considerations to be taken into account when we talk about welfare incentives. There are such things as sliding-scale welfare incentives, the changing picture federally, and so on and so on. So this type of bill, although it represents only one good item, I do not think this is enough. We all know that it is a good principle as stated in the bill, but surely, after so many years of the previous administration doing nothing, I think it is inexcusable that a bill should be brought in like this, with a hurried, patchwork approach.



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-41

I can't understand why the previous administration, in fact, has done so little for welfare incentive in social development over the years. This province has been known, and is known, as a depressing first-rate welfare province. Therefore, on this item, coupled with the fact that the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development has already indicated quite clearly that this area is under review, and his intention is to bring in a position paper in the near future on this item. The other item is, of course, that as chairman of the task force on needs, opportunities, and responsibilities of the individual -- this area is also under review in association with the Department.

I certainly would not tolerate or support such a bill -- a hurried, patch-type of bill -- although it has an important item, in principle, and this item is actually under consideration. I reject the bill on these grounds, until a total review is done -- a total review, which, I hope, has the intention and will bring about the principle of helping the needy, not the greedy, and changing this province from that depressing first-rate welfare province to a first-rate, top, exhilarating, incentive province. Thank you.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a...

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for -- was I correct? -- the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen, or, rather, Taber-Warner.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question. On the subsection of the fourth line, what should it be -- is that a typographical error? There is "where" but I think it should be "were".

MR. HENDERSON:

Yes, that is a typographical error.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the House permit the hon. member to put the question at this time, to the mover of the motion?

MR. BENOIT:

I find some conflict in the statement by the hon. member who just spoke. In the statement he made, in which he suggests that the previous administration has done so little for welfare, but the province has become famous as a welfare province. Either one or the other must be a little off base. But that is a matter of opinion, probably.

Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to say, here, in support of the principle of this bill on second reading, is that, as some members have heard me say before, I have three or four standards that I would like to put forth, that I think are right in line with this, including this one here. In fact, if anything, this may be more liberal or generous than I would have it if I were setting the standards. Having said that, I want it understood that it is not my intention in any way, shape or form to indicate that I intend to deprive the needy of anything that is necessary. I want to bring this up again after I have finished with my point.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the conditions under which we live in our present-day society, where there are so many people who are working on a comparatively low wage and in some cases

48-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

admittedly substandard wages -- which I wanted to talk about after I finish the main points -- that we need to take into serious consideration the fact that there are many people, and I say many, I think, without degree of qualification who are receiving more on normal welfare assistance or social allowance than those who are working at regular full-time occupations. This is particularly true in the areas where there are larger families and the breadwinner is not well-enough trained to acquire a position in a job that pays enough for his family to live on, or if he happens to live in a community where such jobs are not available. I think not only should this principle here apply, but there should be two or three others that should be applied in the same way, and that there should be some kind of a formula that would apply one or more of these principles to the particular situation.

I speak of this matter of the minimum wage to begin with, that if those who are on social allowance, who are employables, who receiving more than what would ordinarily be given as a minimum wage for the kind of work he could do, then he is put in a position that is favourable and above that of his neighbour who has to work for a minimum wage. I think that that should be one of the standards to determine how much would be received on social allowance, whether it be a minimum wage or in the low wage area. I think of our own particular community where we have a number of people who are working for low wages, who have medium-sized families, who live next door to people who receive social allowance, the standards of which permits those on social allowance to have more than those who are working every day for the low wage or the minimum wage, whichever may be the case.

I think that if we are using another standard we should use one that has to do with unemployment insurance. I know that unemployment insurance has been increased recently and this would make an increase in standard at this particular point. But if a man were not working, if he were receiving unemployment insurance, then if he is cut off of unemployment insurance and has to go on social allowance, I do not think that he should receive more than he would receive if he were on unemployment insurance in that particular work in which he was employed or in that particular community where he lives. There are those who receive, on social allowance, more than what his neighbour receives on unemployment insurance, and it tends to take them off of unemployment insurance and seek social allowance.

I am speaking of these cases, Mr. Speaker, where it is not the usual situation, but it is these many exceptions -- and I say many exceptions advisedly -- because they are becoming more frequent -- that creates the dissatisfaction and the discontent between the neighbours when they see these discrepancies in what the people are receiving. I do not think that anyone who is on social allowance, regardless of the size of his family, should receive more than what he would be exempted of income tax, if he were receiving it as a wage, because we know of a number of cases, particularly where there are larger families, where those on social allowance are receiving a sum on which they would have to pay considerable income tax if they were receiving it as a wage. This creates a dissatisfaction on the part of those who have to work for their living.

So if we took at least those three situations into consideration, and created some kind of formula, so that those who are on social allowance would never be receiving more than one or more of these people in this particular category in a given community, we would do away with a great deal of dissatisfaction and discontent on the part of those who do not receive social allowance.

We have worked out, in previous years and more recently, a method whereby those who have large families and where the breadwinner is not able to earn as much as is necessary for adequate food and clothes for his family where they may receive a supplement

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-43

to their wage, as a social allowance. I think this is a good idea, where it can be proven that it's necessary, and it's provided as a minimal supplement to his salary and he continues to work at his regular work. I appreciate the fact that this creates some problems, but I think they can be overcome, and that we'll never be able to solve all the problems. This type of person needs to receive that type of assistance. So, wherever this type of person exists, I think he should receive that supplemental social assistance, and that those who receive complete social assistance, who were unemployable and who couldn't find work or had not been offered work, that they too should be able to receive the equivalent of the low salary plus the supplemental social allowance, in a case of that sort.

Mr. Speaker, I just put those forth as something I realize has been put forth before, but it comes in harmony with this bill. I think it is something that needs to be considered for the future for the sake of discouraging people who remain unemployed or who might otherwise be employed; and for the purpose of eliminating the dissatisfaction on the part of people who are employed and are diligently working, trying to make an honest living, and who see this other situation beside them.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, may I make a correction, please, on the statement made by the previous speaker. I intended to say, the previous administration has done very little for welfare incentives. If I stated otherwise, the correction is now made. Thank you.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, it's not time. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would appear the House is not prepared to grant the hon. member unanimous leave.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to adjourn debate is required?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member could make a motion and I could put it in that way, and then it could be voted on by a majority.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate. I move to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would all those in favour of the motion please say aye; those opposed please say no.

I believe the ayes have it. If there is any doubt, I'll ask the hon. members to stand and be counted -- [Interjections] --

My understanding of the Rule is, subject to argument, but without hearing argument on it, is that we will now proceed onto the next bill.

48-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

Bill No. 203 The Family Homes Expropriation Act

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I had fairly well completed the remarks that I wanted to make in regard to Bill No. 203 the last time it was up. I don't have anything additional to add at this time.

MR. KOZIAK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is not Bill No. 204 next on the Order Paper?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, that's the one I wanted to see debated.

MR. SPEAKER:

It's certainly next on the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's not printed.

MR. KOZIAK:

The bill was passed out, I believe, the other day.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, the billiard rooms bill was slated as printed, and I believe it's next for debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

CLERK:

All right, in spite of the Order Paper --

Bill No. 204 The Billiard Rooms Amendment Act, 1972

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Athabasca, Mr. Appleby, Bill No. 204, The Billiard Rooms Amendment Act, 1972, be read a second time.

I think to point out to the House some advantages in this amendment, I'd just like to read a quote from a letter I've received, which has my feelings, and it goes thus:

"In reference to The Billiard Act as it is, I would like to recommend some changes in keeping with the time and age in which we live. Some of these things are a carry-over from frontier days."

Mr. Speaker, I believe in this time and age that this amendment is very necessary. I feel it will keep the children off the streets, especially the ones who were referred to -- 14 to 16 years old. I think the children in billiard rooms in this day and age -- the way they are run -- are much better off than running in alleys, up and down streets, breaking property, drinking, smoking, and what have you.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-45

I have talked to a number of parents in the time I have presented this legislation, and I have had support from all over the province. The parents would welcome this because they know where their children are. I think the parents who do not wish their children to be in the pool halls will not have to sign approval, and therefore, this bill is not compulsory.

I have also talked to recreation directors in my area. They too, would like to see The Billiard Rooms Act amended so they could bring in children and get them involved in recreation in billiard halls.

I would suggest to you that I have talked to the RCMP and they welcome this idea. They go on to say that the younger children create no problem at all. It is the older ones who do all the damage. I would like to bring you up to date on two accidents that happened in my constituency last week. Two 18-year old boys were killed in a car accident. You can see that we allow young boys to drive; they are out there with an odd beer or what have you, and they get into car accidents. So I am sure the children we allow into the billiard halls between the ages of 14 and 16 are not in that category.

I would like to read a letter to you that I received from Calgary. It is very interesting, and it goes like this:

"I was very interested in your comments in the newspaper to the effect that you wished to introduce legislation which would allow 14-year olds to go into the local pool halls. I think the motion is well worthwhile, and is a step in the right direction. I think that the old-fashioned concept of a pool hall as being a place where youngsters gather to waste time is no longer applicable in our age, in which leisure is becoming a bigger and bigger factor.

Furthermore, when one looks at where the youngsters are on the streets in Calgary at this time, namely around the fronts of shopping centres, convenience stores, one cannot help but feel that perhaps there should be more billiard halls in the community where the youngsters could go and get out of the traffic."

You know, Mr. Speaker, we allow 14-year old boys and girls a driving licence to drive motorbikes. Some of these motorbikes are pretty high powered; and they can travel up and down the streets, across alleys. I have had the case where these motorbikes have caused some injury to older people. If we can do this, surely we can let them into billiard halls where they can have some entertainment, some relaxation and have a form of recreation, which younger people have to have to get rid of their steam.

I would like to read another article about the court cases in our province of Alberta. It goes like this:

"Play pool, good, clean, inexpensive recreation. The best place in town for teens; if they can't behave they can't stay." It goes on to say, "Just go to our magistrate's court. Many days as much as \$1,000 is collected in fines for liquor, automobile and related charges, not to mention insurance rates, narcotics and morality issues. None of these originate in the pool hall. You think you have a problem at the pool hall? After 20 years we wonder at the calibre of parents who lack control of a 14-year old. Ignorance is not an excuse for the law. I leave you with this thought -- think about it."

I would like to suggest that we could improve pool halls. We could make the owners bring them up and have recreation centres. A few years ago you weren't allowed in the bowling alleys unless you

48-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

were 18 years old. Now they are a family recreation centre. This too, could become a reality in the billiard room.

Some people have said I haven't gone far enough in this act, and suggested that we have no age limit. Well, I want to leave this to the House, let them decide. But I thought, we have got to start someplace, and that therefore is why I made the amendment that we allow 14 to 16 year olds with written permission into pool halls.

I would like to go on and say that people have found out in today's society that all the problems do not centre around the pool hall, and it is not the root of all evil.

Also, another letter I received, and it goes on like this:

"I personally have felt for some time now, that the province should take a firm step in the matter of pool halls, and set up a Legislative Committee or a commission of concerned people who would look into the whole pool hall business in Alberta and advise the government of what kind of steps or assistance should be given to make pool halls better understood and appreciated in the community.

It seems to me that it would be a wonderful opportunity for a civic minded person to influence a lot of young people and perhaps, give them a chance they may need. For example, they could have work opportunities, or education opportunities. If there was literature made available, they could while away their time discussing opportunities. I would also imagine that just as older people very often take their problems to the bar and discuss them with the bartender, or the person next to them, it is most likely youngsters would go to the pool hall and very often unleash their problems on the pool hall operator or the other people in the pool hall with them.

If we are ever going to solve problems and provide opportunities for youth, maybe this is one of the good places to start."

Now, I have many more letters, Mr. Speaker, but the time is running short and I notice the hon. members on the other side would like to enter this debate. I would urge that all the members here support this bill.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few short comments on seconding this bill. The hon. Member for Whitecourt has made, I think, a very good presentation of the case for the bill. And he has mentioned some things that I think are highly relevant in the society we live in today. One of these things was the matter of behavior, and behavior is something that probably in this type of permissiveness that we have today, is something that has to be developed, with a sense of responsibility, through the home, and in public places too. And I think that the pool halls or the billiard rooms, if they're properly run, can help to develop this sense of responsibility within the youngster.

One thing I think we have to take note of, and it is a fact that in the type of legislation we have, which sets the age of 16 as when you can enter billiard halls, this type of legislation actually creates a certain amount of, you might say, contempt for the law. Actually unknowingly, and not really realizing the fact, many of these youngsters who do go into the pool halls are under the age of 16, and in many places this is accepted and unquestioned. Having this sort of an attitude towards the law that governs the billiard halls can easily develop to be an attitude that would also be accepted by these young individuals in other areas of the law as well. And I think this is unfortunate. In fact I would almost

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-47

question the fact as to whether we should have any age limitations on these types of facilities at all. And when I speak of facilities here, I think that one of the things that is going to be necessary as far as the billiard halls are concerned, is a complete upgrading, and this is being done in many areas.

I can think, in recent years, of how this has developed and the attitude that has developed towards billiard halls in many of the larger centres in the cities, and the larger towns where the facilities are so attractive, the lighting is excellent, and the general decor of the place is so good, that in quite a few of these places now, you find ladies going in to play billiards, snooker and other games and you find that this was not something that was being done a few years ago. I think these are the type of facilities that have to be encouraged in these kind of places.

So, as far as the new bill is concerned, I think it's highly necessary, and I would certainly say that it should be supported 100 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I support this bill, being The Billiard Rooms Amendment Act, 1972, and there are a number of points I want to make just for the record.

In a society that's shifting away from the work ethic to a work-leisure ethic, or even more appropriately, a leisure-work ethic, I think it's vital and important that we increase the opportunity for recreation and leisure for all, for all ages, any sex.

The point that should be made here is that private clubs, and we know this, across the province, do in fact allow any age, any sex, to go into the recreational room, and in fact, participate in the game of billiards. Therefore, with this point in mind, I would hope that the hon. member who introduced this bill will consider an amendment that I intend to bring in during the committee reading to allow all ages to participate in this leisurely, recreational activity.

MR. KOZIAK:

A few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, on the bill. There has been some suggestion made that if the bill were passed it would keep some of the youngsters out of the parks. There has also been the suggestion that if we're afraid that the youngsters who frequent pool halls were exposed to unusual language, that they probably would find the same exposure in this House.

The only real comment which I would like to make, in adding to the points made on this debate, Mr. Speaker, is that perhaps the amendment could be made retroactive so that all the people who sit in this House who played pool before they were 16 could rest easily and be absolved of their sins.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against this bill, as proposed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt who I know is reputed to be the pool shark of this side of the House. I might say at the outset that my opposition to this bill does not arise over the fact that I got duped into sponsoring the hon. Member for Whitecourt on the Miles-for-Millions Walk, in that he said that he was going to walk it backwards, and when I supported him at the basis of 10 cents a mile, I found that rather than walking it backwards, he meant that

48-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

he was starting at the end of the march, and marching frontwards. So whenever I see something presented by the hon. Member for Whitecourt, I'm a little worried about the deceptiveness, but I have a few reasons why I think that this bill is not proper, Mr. Speaker.

1) I regard it as being discriminatory. 2) I regard it as being devious and deceptive. 3) I regard it to be naive. 4) I regard it as being encouraging indoor sports, when in fact we should be passing laws to encourage outdoor sports. 5) Why should he put his efforts into pool halls, as if there was some problem with respect to our dealing with pool halls, when maybe he would like to reduce the age limit on restricted movies for young children, and things like that. I'm sure there are better areas to spend our efforts on than billiard rooms. 6) I believe it to be totally unenforceable.

Now, my first reason, Mr. Speaker, as to the discriminatory aspects of the bill have already been alluded to. If we are going to have a valid bill, then why this 14-age situation that has been set in here? In fairness to the hon. member who proposed the bill, I think he would well agree that if he is going to be consistent and not discriminatory, that he would remove this undue, improper age restriction of 14-years.

I think it's also discriminatory from the point of view that it requires these young 14-year olds to have to go to their parents to get written consent. It places them in a very unfortunate position vis-a-vis their parents. And I don't see the purpose from the point of having written consent because I don't think it would ever really work.

It is also very naive in that the hon. member seems to think that this bill will discourage young people from, as he says, running the alleys, drinking, and smoking, and what have you. I'm not sure what the hon. member meant when he talked about 'what have you', but nevertheless I don't think the bill will ever assist anyone by stopping this alleged corruption that the hon. member is concerned with. In fact I might add that some of the pool halls I've been in would only encourage it with the bad language, the drinking that goes on, and the type of people who frequent some of our pool halls.

I would suggest that it is unenforceable from the point of view of being able to deal with the bill in a realistic manner. How could the person in charge of the billiard room really know when a youngster is 14, 15, or 16 these days, because age is very difficult to determine. It would place a very unfair onus upon the owner of the billiard parlour who must try to enforce this regulation.

Other than those very valid six points in opposition to the bill, I support the remaining portion of the bill; the name of the act is very good and it's got a nice number, but other than that, Mr. Speaker, I must state my opposition to the bill at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to say a few words with regard to this bill and I wish to state that I support it. Some hon. members feel it has some minor defects. I don't think they are insurmountable, and they could probably best put their brilliance and intelligence towards working out a good amendment rather than knocking it flat.

This is not obligatory. You can take it or leave it and I believe that billiard halls in this province have acquired a respectability in recent years that you no longer need to worry that they're centres of corruption and places where children hide from their parents when they want to smoke, or drink beer, or what have you.



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-49

It's a form of recreation. In many cases now billiard halls are built in the same building as bowling alleys and while one may be more of a physical sport than the other, it nevertheless, is a popular form of recreation. I'm not just sure when they say 'billiard halls' if they mean, generally, pool halls. I believe the word 'billiard hall' encompasses all the different variety of games that are played in pool halls.

I'm very much in favour of this. There's nothing wrong with requiring 14-year olds to get permission for a thing like this. I believe that even in this day and age that 14 year olds must get permission from their parents once in a while for various types of activities -- so this is nothing new. The principle is sound, and I would like to see this bill go to committee, and if it needs changes then that is where they should be brought in.

Although we all want our children to go to the parks and go outdoors and play games there are weather conditions, seasons, when this isn't practicable. I enjoy a game of billiards and I will occasionally play billiards with a young man. I believe that they can learn good sportsmanship, co-operation, fair play, and it is a game of skill. In fact, if it is not, then perhaps it depends on how well you play, but it is definitely a game of skill. Many homes have billiard tables in their basements or in their rumpus rooms. Children are encouraged to play. As I stated, I enjoy an occasional game. You often see young people, boys and girls, indulging in this game. It's a wholesome sport and usually well supervised.

I'm very much in favour of this bill and I commend the mover for bringing it to the attention of the House. I fully support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Stettler.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few brief words. I do not think that we should approve this motion. As a matter of fact, I do not think we need The Billiard Rooms Act either, and I would like to suggest that we vote down this motion and ask the government to seriously consider including The Billiard Rooms Act under Bill No. 52, The Statutes Repeal Act. The Billiard Rooms Act, as I understand it, deals mostly with things that you cannot do in a billiard room, and you cannot do those things in a bowling alley or a grocery store, either. I do not really think that we need The Billiard Rooms Act anymore. I think that the government should include this under the Bill 52, The Statutes Repeal Act.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion, because I would like to see it reach the committee stage and, perhaps, with some suitable amendments, and even considering the remarks of the hon. member opposite, we could finally dispose of this matter of this particular act.

My reason in joining in the debate is that the Stettler school had a class in the Legislature the day that this particular bill was read for the first time. The vice-principal of the Stettler Junior High School has sent me a letter, giving me some remarks of the students. It is these particular remarks which I would like to leave with the members.

There was a total, apparently, of 95 children involved in this particular matter when it was discussed. There were nine that voted

48-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

against the amendment, 56 voted in favour of the amendment, and four had no opinion. One particular class of 26 students formulated their own amendment, namely that the age should be lowered to 14 with parental consent not necessary.

The student observations regarding the amendment were rather interesting. Their comments were that the present laws regarding the operation of billiard rooms are not followed, nor enforced, and neither will this one be. So, why not do away with the age limit? I think that they are very conscious, as young people, of the double standard that we seem to use in our society, and perhaps the idea presented by the hon. member opposite, who was the last speaker, is a sound one.

The other observation was, "why should a billiard room be any different from a bowling alley, and why is any restriction necessary?" Their other comment was, "Parental consent will be easily forged. The amendment will encourage kids to be dishonest." I think that they themselves are very conscious of this. I therefore support the bill to get it into the committee stage. Thank you.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words regarding this bill. I have listened with interest to the permissive comments of most of them. I think there are only two that have spoken, and declared themselves honestly, and that is the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo and the hon. Member for Calgary Bow. I appreciate their comments. Let's be honest! We're all grown up -- let's be factual in this thing, not cover it up with a bunch of soap. We have all grown up through the pool halls. My goodness, what are we talking about anyway? Anything...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Speak for yourself.

MR. D. MILLER:

I can speak for myself, and I know I am speaking for everybody. Because, anything that will relieve parents of their responsibility, by sending them off with a note to a pool hall or a billiard hall -- this is ridiculous. That is only contributing to delinquency in the home. Let me remind all those in the House, including the news media, and especially them, I am not ashamed to stand up and be counted on this. If we pass this bill, as sure as you are born, it is just as reasonable to expect that there will be another motion or a bill next year, reducing age to 12 years old. How ridiculous.

It isn't what the game will do, and some have mentioned that many people have pool tables in their homes, which is all right. But they are supervised. But the atmosphere that is created in most of the billiard halls -- and I haven't been blind to them I grew up in them -- is not conducive to youth nor to anyone else. Without belabouring the point or telling you what goes on, try to remember! I don't want to make any accusations here, but as a parent -- any modification in The Billiard Room Act to relieve parents of their responsibility to train and emphasize observance of standards, will only contribute to further delinquents in the home and then the community.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to -- I hope we can come to a vote here -- I just want to use an example of the positive benefits that can be gained from this particular act by using a negative example. I have gained information from reliable sources that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, although he did play billiards as a youth,

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-51

---

never had the opportunity to play before the age of 16 and look what he turned into.

DR. PAPROSKI:

One point of clarification to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. member has spoken, has he not?

DR. PAPROSKI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FARRAN:

I'll try it again. I move the question now be put.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is moving the previous question which does not interrupt the debate but only cuts off the opportunity to make amendments. The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Do you all agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member like to make a formal motion and I will put the question?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, if it will make the members feel any better I would be pleased to speak out the clock for one minute and then move the motion. If you would prefer to do that. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed, agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

. . .then I would formally move leave to adjourn the debate. . .

MR. R. SPEAKER:

. . .seconded by Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

. . .seconded by Mr. Speaker.

48-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc moves that the debate be adjourned. Would all those in favour please say aye?

[The motion was carried on a voice vote.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of information I would just like to advise the House that this coming Monday in the afternoon, after the Question Period on Orders of the Day, we will be dealing with second reading of Bill No. 1, The Alberta Bill of Rights and in addition, Bill No. 2, its companion bill, and at the same time Bill No. 34, The Sexual Sterilization Repeal Act. So it is proposed then, next Monday afternoon, Bills No. 1, 2, and 34 for second reading.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I was wondering if I could get some information from either the hon. House Leader or the Premier that there is no intention of the government to give this bill final passage in this session?

MR. LOUGHREED:

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with the response has to do with the interpretation of the word session. It is not intended that there be final passage until the fall and we are proposing to hold the bill after the committee stage and prior to third reading, all three -- pardon me, I am sorry -- Bill No. 1 and Bill No. 2, not Bill No. 34.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, further information. Is it intended to have the bill debated in committee during the present sittings?

MR. LOUGHREED:

Mr. Speaker, if I could comment on that, it is certainly my understanding that with a bill that we have left on the Order Paper at the committee stage but that has gone through committee and if there is no difficulty in coming back prior to third reading, reverting back to the committee stage and making an amendment to deal with it before you vote on it on third reading. But if there is any dispute about that procedural matter, then we would certainly be pleased to hear about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until this evening at 8:00.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 p.m.]

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-53

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if you could advise on what basis the front door is closed to the young people outside and on whose instructions?

MR. SPEAKER:

I think perhaps that question might privately or in an appropriate time be directed to the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The hon. government House Leader has moved that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly resolve into Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 8:03.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

Department of Lands and Forests (cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order. Department of Lands and Forests, page 45.

The following appropriation was agreed to without debate:

APPROPRIATION 1801 Minister's Office \$ 25,110

APPROPRIATION 1802 General Administration

DR. WARRACK:

I must be confused, Mr. Chairman, I thought we did Appropriation 1801 the other day.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Not according to my records, I am sorry.

DR. WARRACK:

I was hoping that if we passed it three or four times that this might escalate in the salary and all of those things.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like remind the Chairman that according to Votes and Proceedings, he was doing it last time too.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

DR. WARRACK:

Hon. members will recall that I had taken this opportunity, as is the custom, to make some brief remarks on the Department of Lands and Forests. I had begun these in a manner that I had planned to proceed throughout the entire area that is covered in the responsibilities of the Department of Lands and Forests. I have

48-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

since had some requests -- I think it might be fair even to say pleas -- pleas that I restrict my remarks somewhat, and I shall do so, but I shall do so after having thought about it for some considerable period of time because I don't believe that I am one of the people that has, in any sense, wasted this House's time at all. But nevertheless, respecting the needs of people to get on with the business of the House, I shall restrict my remarks considerably from what I had initially planned.

I had, in the briefest of reviews last day, made introductory and general remarks respecting the Department of Lands and Forests; and in particular, with dividing the operational divisions, as I call them, from the support areas in the Department of Lands and Forests and described each of these generally, then began and gave a statistical package of information respecting the Lands Division of the Department of Lands and Forests. That being completed, then I would like to move on to the organization of the Lands Division in the Department of Lands and Forests. I shall not describe the work within each division as I had initially planned, but rather outline the six basic branches that have responsibilities in the Lands Division and only itemize the areas of responsibility within them, leaving it to questions here or at other opportunities for further pursuit of detail.

So within the Lands Division of the Department of Lands and Forests then, we have six branches. One is the Land Appraisal and Planning Branch within which the appraisals are done. There is a good deal of this work that has to be done in the Department of Lands and Forests; the land use and planning, and some degree of extension, a lot of this in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture. These are the functions, then, performed within the branch, land appraisal and planning.

Within the Grazing Branch -- and we have, as hon. members will have noted from the Department of Lands and Forests annual report -- a very considerable amount of grazing lands in Alberta and they are disposed in a number of different ways. I have considerable backup information on this, where we have grazing leases, we have grazing permits, we have grazing reserves, community pastures, pay permits, and range surveys that are conducted within the Grazing Branch.

The third branch within the Lands Division is the Special Land Use Branch. This is an area of some considerable focus of late, particularly because of the surface access to lands that is necessary in order to utilize some of the natural resources that are sub-surface natural resources in the Province of Alberta. So toward these ends, we grant miscellaneous leases, miscellaneous permits, mineral surface leases, licenses of occupation, some subdivisions, and some sand and gravel dispositions as well.

Fourthly, we have the Homestead Branch, and you recall -- when I talked briefly the other day -- that there was a difference between the white, and yellow zones which are settlement zones. The yellow zone is basically the homestead zone, with the white zone being the settlement zone, that is the now non-homestead, private land disposition settlement zones of Alberta. That's the distinction there, basically, and the homestead activities and the subsequent sales are handled at that point.

We have a very high degree of administration within the Land Division, and we consequently have a specific Office Administration Branch that handles statistics, equipment and supplies, and land reservations; so that if a reservation against any other disposition is agreed upon as a matter of decision, this is noted and coded so that no other disposition can inadvertently occur. The land assembly purchases and the posting of lands are also handled within the Office Administration Branch.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-55

Finally, and sixth, the Sales and Cultivation Lease Branch is the area within which the agricultural farm sales take place, and the farm and rural development sales that work with the local development committees take place. We have cultivation leases, cultivation permits, and rural development leases that are handled within that branch of the Lands Division Department of Lands and Forests.

Those are the six branches therein and a very brief description of the functions of each.

I'd then like to move on to the Forestry Division, and describe some of the highlights of this. The Forestry Division also conducted MLA sessions, as did the Lands Division, earlier this session. The forests of Alberta are basically located within what is described as the green zone. I'll defer any description of the green zone, beyond mentioning that the green zone is around 60 per cent of Alberta's land surface, and secondly, the green zone is the area of Alberta where forest use of the land is the primary use of the land. There are other uses, but the primary priority use of the land is for forestry purposes, within the green zone.

I might mention to the House for your interest -- and you might wish to jot these figures down -- that the volume of lumber supply in Alberta at this time, as appraised, is 59 billion cubic feet. That's 59 billion cubic feet as the forest supplies of Alberta, as appraised at this time, in our inventory. Some 23 billion of this is aspen, or poplar if you like, and that's about 40 per cent. You'll recall March 24th when I made an announcement in the House of our hopes of a timber disposition in the Slave Lake area, that this had reference to aspen as being a previously unmarketable species of timber supply, and that it would be a great plus, not only for that region, but for the province as a whole, to have the opportunity for that kind of forest supply in a marketable way for the manufacture of studs and also in a by-product, the flakeboard manufacture -- that can be a replacement for plywood -- to be built out of aspen.

Hon. members will also recall that within the last couple of weeks, I did table a document that I found extremely helpful as I tried to get a grasp of the realities of the forest supply situation in Alberta and the nature of its disposition. I just draw your attention to it again, here, noting that there are three basic ways that we have dispositions of timber in Alberta for utilization of the resource. One is through Forest Management Agreement areas. Another is through quotas, and it was the quota system focus that this publication was meant to portray. Thirdly, permits, which are generally much smaller, and also are much shorter in the time of the disposition, normally. So I bring your attention to those matters.

Within the Forestry Division there are again, of course, a number of branches that are the components of the Forestry Division, Department of Lands and Forests; and again, I would like to sketch by them very quickly for your information, and use only the most brief description within each.

There is the Timber Management Branch, as a component; one of six branches that comprises the Forestry Division. The Timber Management Branch, whose responsibility is the surveys and inventories of forest supply across Alberta; the nature of the woods operations that occur in the province of Alberta; the development and appraisal of forest management plans; the economic analysis related to it; reforestation, and the sales of counting functions related to timber dispositions. That is the Timber Management Branch.

An extremely important branch, as we all will agree, I think, without dissent, is the Forest Protection Branch, whose job it is not only to protect the forests against fire, but other hazards as well; although naturally, the largest problem is related to fire. Last year happens to have been an unusually bad year, with upwards of \$6

48-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

million having to be spent for fire-fighting purposes. We can get into some detail at that point in the budget, if you wish. The average over the last decade has been about a \$2 million per year timber value loss; so that with an unusually bad fire season we might appraise this at something on the order of about \$2.5 million to \$3 million in value of timber loss last year due to fire. That is a total then of \$8.5 million to \$9 million. That is a major item.

Within that and respecting that, we have a fire control; we have a weather set-up, and two of our own meteorologists in the Department of Lands and Forests; a communications network related to the entire Forestry Division, but also used by the Parks and Fish and Wildlife Divisions on a co-operative basis; and a research arm of the Forest Protection Branch. So that is the second branch within Forest Protection.

We have a Land Use Branch to look after the land dispositions that are involved in the green zone. This involves a great deal of multiple use planning. This would be an opportunity to give some re-emphasis to a study that we are currently conducting, and fairly near conclusion, called The Poothills Land Use Allocation Study, to which the hon. Member for Highwood and I had some discussion in the Question Period two or three days ago, related to the Canmore corridor. The multiple use planning then, is basically conducting that particular study. There is an operations section, a broader land use research branch, a development co-ordinator to relate all of the aspects of development that are taking place and are planned to take place within the forestry area of Alberta.

The oil spill control arm is located within the Land Use Branch. I might take a moment to mention that those of you who had an opportunity to look at the Edmonton Journal today will notice there was some expression of concern respecting oil spill problems that could conceivably arise out of the contemplated pipelines from Alaska. I think it is important to note that we have here an area with some considerable research, experience and a private sector-government inter-related effort correlated to solve quickly any oil spill problems that might result. This is the kind of nucleus of experience that could be beefed up to meet the greater needs that we might have if we had a greater volume of pipeline and a greater volume of product moving through the Province of Alberta. So I think the oil spill control aspect is something to take particular note of. That is the Land Use Branch, and those are three of the six.

We have a Construction and Maintenance Branch whose concern it is to handle roads, several of the airstrips that we have -- and I might mention at the outset we do have in forestry, airports -- the conducting of commercial air traffic in three of them, at Footner Lake, at Fort Chipewyan and Slave Lake. Those are used -- at Fort Chipewyan, for example, as Dr. Bouvier would know, Pacific Western Airline flies there, but it is, in fact, a forestry air strip. The roads, air strips, buildings, mechanical operations including the development of some of the equipment for fire-fighting purposes -- and one we have some fun talking about called the 'Monsoon Bucket'. Again, we would be a little short of time if we simply deferred to fun things to talk about; This is something that was developed on a very economic basis by the ingenuity of some of our own people here in Alberta and it's being used by some of the other provinces in Canada as well, having seen how well it works. And also, it's very quick and mobile, flexible, handled from a helicopter. That in fact, in the design stage, was from the equipment development arm within the Construction and Maintenance Branch of the Forestry Division.

We have an Administration Division because we have a great deal of public contact, and this is handled through the Administration Division. We have, interestingly, a Training Branch, which is the sixth now within the Forestry Division, that's the Forest Technology School conducted at Hinton. And interestingly also, is that there is



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-57

a working relationship with NAIT there; there's the Jasper-Cache Forest that is related specifically to the school, it's just south east of Hinton. The Alberta Junior Forest Rangers program is conducted at Hinton through our Training Branch at the Department of Lands and Forests, Forestry Division.

So those are the branches -- that was almost a pun, wasn't it? -- of the Forestry Division, Department of Lands and Forests, and I would just mention one more thing respecting organization, because those are all branches related to function. There's another element of our operation and organization within the Department of Lands and Forests, that's related to geography, and that's the separation of the geographic areas of Alberta that have forest products in them of a substantial nature. They're divided into eleven different forest units that comprise this forest supply area within the Province of Alberta, and each of these is called forests. So we have actually eleven different forests, where one forest is one of the geographic units within which we administer field operations in the Department of Lands and Forests.

I think I need not name them off, or even make further comment on them, but once again, to take this opportunity to draw to your attention that this information is available in considerable abundance in the Forestry part of the annual report tabled recently in the House. I don't think there is any division of any department nor any branch of any division anywhere in the government that certainly doesn't have its problems, and I'll not go into these to a great extent except that it is clear there are a number of areas where we have some problems, particularly, and I think of this now because this is the time of year when this is a problem. We have got to get into a more comprehensive and effective rural settlement areas fire protection relationship, because a lot of the forest fires that come about, particularly at this time of year and then on the tail end -- I was going to say, of the fire season, but Mark Byington said he was going to shoot a fire if they were in season -- but a lot of the fires go into the forest areas on the front and back parts of the season within which we have considerable fire problems in Alberta. That is the major thing.

Another major thing, along with that protection area that I can't resist mentioning, is that we've got to increasingly, as the public of Alberta, recognize the non-timber forest uses; and that in these non-timber forest uses, we have some great need to meet an increasing demand and pressure on this resource by people. And the gentleman from the areas that have this people pressure, from roughly about Nordegg south to the U.S. border, would be most fully acquainted with that. I've talked a number of times with the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest because I think he probably has about as much problem in that area as anyone.

I would mention briefly a division that is under-rated, in the sense of how important it is, because it does not get quite the attention it deserves, considering that there's not that much public contact. It's just like the hockey players, and it's about halfway through the second period now, where there's always some under-rated people. And one of the under-rated divisions that's extremely important is the Technical Division of the Department of Lands and Forests, within which we undertake the mapping, photogrammetric aerial photography, survey and technical services, required primarily by the Department of Lands and Forests but supplied across the entire government by this division.

The people that are in charge of some of the areas that use these technical services, such as the Department of Highways and the Department of Public Works, will have a very full appreciation of just how important it is that these technical jobs be done in a precise way, because if you make some capital investments on an imprecise design, in a technical sense, then you have got to remedy

48-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

the job. Everyone who has had any experience at all on any type of practical work, whether it is on the farm or elsewhere, knows that remedial work is the most expensive work that there is.

I emphasize that matter in the Technical Division, and mention to you that there is a Land Use Assignment Division there, whose job it is to deal with these technical matters; a Legal Section; a General Administration Section, because of the volume of the work involved; a Cartographic Section, (that means mapping); a Photogrammetric Section, within which the aerial photography and the aeromosaics are put together -- and, incidentally, from these, and using a machine that gives you the third dimension and measuring angles and distances, you actually do a pretty good job of estimating the timber supply in an area through an analysis of the aerial photographs, so you can see how helpful that would be.

That, then, is all within the Technical Division of the Department of Lands and Forests, and the treatment of that division in my description here, like the other divisions, I suppose, is all too brief.

Also, we have the Fish and Wildlife Division, which is a division that is becoming increasingly important. It is increasingly important, it seems to me, in a couple of ways. There is a focus of conflict within the Fish and Wildlife Division, just from the fact that you have got, in many instances, private land with a wildlife resource that is, in fact, public property. But the geography of things makes you try to get over private land to get this public resource. You are bound to have a conflict problem.

So we have a hunter/landowner problem that, in my own mind, forms up to be more of a hunter-vandal/landowner problem. It seems rather clear to me that the hunter-vandal, or perhaps it should be vandal-hunter, is a person who is taking away the rights of not only the landowner, but the legitimate hunter-sportsman as well. If I may say so, this is a problem that I feel has not been sufficiently faced in the past, as difficult as it is.

One other thing that I must say, regarding the Fish and Wildlife Division, is that it has a great deal to do with -- and here is the second basic point -- a great deal to do with what people feel is a quality of life in Alberta -- a quality experience as you live year by year in a beautiful place like the Province of Alberta, in terms of the aesthetics of the opportunity to be able to hunt, or the opportunity to simply go out and be among these beautiful creatures that are put on the earth, and that are of great value, even if you are not physically shooting them, harvesting them, or whatever. There is a subjective, aesthetic value to them of which we are all aware. This means that we have to concern ourselves a great deal with such problems as habitat development, because there is no question that we are increasingly losing fish and wildlife habitat as time goes on, and industrial and/or other kinds of development occurs. There is a great need to not only begin, but to do some catch-up, and then go forward in the restoration of these habitats for fish and wildlife, particularly as we have an increasing focus on the importance of these aspects of our lives in how we feel about the quality of life as we live it in Alberta.

Within the Fish and Wildlife Division, we have the Fisheries Division, which has its specific purposes respecting the sport fishery potential in Alberta, the commercial fishing potential in Alberta, and in fact, the maintenance of this aesthetic quality of life that it in part provides.

Similarly, too, the Wildlife Branch within the Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of Lands and Forests, and it has its overall purpose in terms of not only the maintenance, but the increasing provision of this resource in line with the recreational

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-59

and economic well-being of people as they desire. Again, the point has to be to go beyond simply a maximization of yield, in terms of wildlife, because that involves the physical nature of the animals involved, but to go beyond that towards a concept that is well known to be called optimization, that takes into account these things that you really cannot measure very well, but you know they are important.

Thirdly, in the third branch of the Fish and Wildlife Division is the Administration Enforcement Branch and there have been dramatic increases in the number of hunters, in the number of things that need to be done over the last 10 or 12 years as was so vividly illustrated on Monday of this week in the presentation to MLA's of the Fish and Wildlife Division analysis of responsibilities. And those of you who had the opportunity to be there I'm sure will agree that this in an increasing area of the services to which we need to pay attention.

Moving on quickly, because I'm taking even more, I'm not cutting off quite as much time as I had intended. But finally then to the Parks Division and I'll skip a short history of the Parks Division although I did want to do that, to the point of moving to the description that we have, in fact, some 51 areas designated as provincial parks within the province of Alberta. Some 46 of these have some degree of development to them, the other five do not, and they're distributed -- of course you can't really see this -- but I want to use this geographic area of the province as interfaced against the distribution of provincial parks in Alberta to note a couple of things particularly related to Mr. Farran's motion -- it was disappointing that it could not get to a vote earlier today -- to note that when the motion or resolution is basically talking about a greater people orientation of parks, you find when you place the distribution of parks as against the distribution of population, you find it's very adverse. And it's not well correlated at all.

So, in fact, if it's the desire of the public and this Assembly that the dispersion of the parks more readily accommodate the nature of the distribution of the population, there are some rather dramatic changes that would be necessary.

The parks management, itself, involves the field staff and the operational activities that have to take place within the parks in order that they be properly handled and properly stored, in some cases, and in any case, preserved so that they're available for people in the future.

I'll not discuss further any policy matters as I see them so far related to parks. Although I know that everyone has some views on them, I'll save those remarks, more appropriately, I think, for the next opportunity for Mr. Farran's resolution to come to the top of the Order Paper.

The final thing I would like to do, is pay a bit of tribute to some of the gentlemen in this room, and ladies, who have from time to time been extremely helpful on specific things; and as an opportunity to be a sounding board on 'what do you think of this idea or that idea' throughout the Department of Lands and Forests in all divisions, and they are: Marvin Moore from Smoky River, Peter Trynchy from Whitecourt, Frank Appleby from Athabasca, Bill Purdy from Stony Plain and you, Mr. Chairman, Bill Diachuk from Edmonton Beverly. I did want to pay that tribute because of the help you have given.

That's as much detail as I think I'll offer. I have managed to be only three minutes beyond my target and that's working with a whole hour's talk and preparation and so that's not doing too badly in terms of cutting it down and letting us get on with the job.

48-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sorenson and then Mr. Ruste.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice a few concerns and observations regarding this department. And I will agree the hon. minister hasn't contributed to a long session and I don't believe I have. I have asked the hon. Member for Bow Valley to tug my coat-tail when I've gone five minutes.

In the last few years we have noticed an increasing amount of poaching, night hunting, illegal fishing, and other game offences. We're also witnessing snowmobiles working in co-operation with aircraft, chasing deer and hunting them down. We're going to have to check this flood and we'll have to check it upstream. The Wildlife Amendment Act was a step in this direction, but I believe it was a very small step.

Many people are concerned today with the small amount of Fish and Wildlife personnel in this province, and these men are facing insurmountable odds. Since 1968 they have been given the added responsibility of checking out oilfield pollution. Also they are charged with overseeing the Alberta Hunter Training program. In 1961 enforcement officers numbered 59 and were responsible for approximately 296,500 licencees. This was a ratio of one officer to 5,042 license holders. In 1970, enforcement officers dropped to a total of 56, a drop of three from nine years previous. Yet the licencees now number 330,000, a ratio of one officer for 5,900 license holders. Other enforcement agencies consider one officer for 1,000 inadequate, while our fish and wildlife officers are now responsible for approximately 35,000 people. These men are overworked and perhaps underpaid. This, combined with the futility of trying to adequately police such a large area, is certainly a main factor in the force losing many of their better personnel to other fields.

I would hereby recommend that the government continue to increase the enforcement officers by 30 men. That is six officers a year for five years, as was started by the previous government. Only last years increase of six was completely offset by the resignation of six men, who went to other fields.

I believe also that conservation should receive more attention in our schools. The Alberta Hunter Training Program is excellent and should be stressed. Wildlife personnel should be visiting our schools, explaining firearms safety and present day wildlife rules and regulations. Conservation and wildlife films should be used extensively in our schools as well.

I recall an incident that happened in Grade X. It was at the start of the term and the teacher assigned the class oral compositions -- we could choose our own subject and we were given about a week to prepare. We could speak between three and five minutes. One young chap chose the subject, 'Safe Gun Handling'. The day arrived and he was called to the front, and he was a farmer type boy and he ambled up -- announced that he was going to speak on Safe Gun Handling. He told the class that he would list the 'don'ts' first and then the 'do's'. Number one, he said, don't shoot into an empty building, there may be people in it -- and the class erupted in laughter. The teacher was kind of touchy and she stormed to her feet and finally calmed things down, and she told the young chap to sit down, and then asked someone else to speak. That young chap was never given the opportunity again to present his good views on safe gun handling. I came away with the thought that perhaps you can discuss anything or everything in the schools, but not safe gun handling.

Two youths from my constituency have been killed within the last six months -- perhaps if they had had the advantage of training in

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-61

the school, it may not have happened. I wonder, are there more guns than cars in Alberta? I don't know, but I think the safety of guns should certainly be stressed.

Sometime ago I raised the question of big horn sheep and how their numbers are diminishing, in the States especially. Eagles have now reached a critical point, whereas a few years ago we would see them coming down from the North -- I don't remember seeing any this past year flying over our land. We know what is happening to the falcon, and I think we have reached the point where certain of our game birds are threatened with extinction, and it's a question of endangered species that I'd like to discuss for just a few minutes.

I'd like to read a letter that came from an elderly gentleman who lives just a few miles from my place. He is retired to his little home in a grove just south of Sedgewick. He says the sharp-tailed grouse, to which the misnomer of prairie chicken is so often applied, is a large brownish grouse, mainly white below with 'V' marks on breast, and pointed tail. The male has an orange comb over the eye. Every spring the sharp-tailed grouse gather on their ancestral dancing grounds, where at dawn the males perform their courting dance with much pomp and strutting. The female plays a passive role in this performance, but mating occurs here. Unfortunately their dancing grounds are being destroyed.

This desirable bird is steadily being reduced in numbers and may be on the road to extinction, like the prairie chicken. Spraying roadsides and fields with poison, and poachers carrying rifles and guns in their truck cabs and cars, are the chief causes of this senseless killing. Yes, where a few years ago we had three dancing grounds on our land, now there are none and I have not seen this bird on my land for five years. I don't believe I have seen five of them in the past five years.

Do you think it can happen here in Alberta? I think the North Americans have contributed their share to the endangerment of certain species. The passenger pigeon was a remarkable bird, capable of flying at speeds up to 60 miles per hour according to the research of John James Audubon, who also credited the bird with phenomenal eyesight. The pigeon travelled in sky-blackening flocks and this contributed to his undoing, for he was killed by the thousands, by the millions, sold in markets, eaten by farmers, or fed to livestock. Audubon once described a typical pigeon-killing spree which took place in the forest along the banks of Kentucky's Green River.

"As the period of their, the pigeons, arrival approached, their foes anxiously prepared to meet them," said Audubon. "Some were furnished with iron pots containing sulphur, others with torches of pine knots, many with poles, the rest with guns. Suddenly there burst forth a general cry of 'here they come.' The noise which they made, though yet distant, reminded me of a hard gale at sea, passing through the rigging of a close-reefed vessel. As the birds passed over me, I felt a current of air that surprised me. Thousands were knocked down by the pole men and the birds continued to pour in. The men fell upon the birds with poles and torches, the rifle fire continued all night long." I will skip a piece.

"But one day to everybody's apparent surprise, there was only one passenger pigeon left on earth. Her name was Martha and she lived out her days in the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens. You can see her today sitting lifelike in a glass cage in the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History. Martha, the last of her species died at 1:00 pm, September 1, 1914 aged 29," says the attached card.

48-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

I read that some man, some years ago, built a boat to save his own skin and also the skins of animals and birds. I would like to suggest, Mr. Minister, that maybe you are a latter-day Noah, and you are going to have to watch out for this flood of people that is coming into our province; a flood of industry, a flood of development, a flood of cultivation, a flood of hunters, and foreign hunters who wish to cross our borders, mostly for trophies. You are going to have to stand in the gap between wildlife and the ones that are threatening. We are going to have to check the flood upstream and we will have to check it with well thought out programs. I am not advocating putting the gun on the rack. I would be hypocritical if I did that. I enjoy the hunt myself. But anything to make sure that our wildlife survives will receive my co-operation.

Mr. Minister, I want to present to you a reproduction of a painting by Lynn Bowd Hunt. It is a picture of a ruffed grouse. It represents the endangered species. I am presenting it to you because I like the birds, I want that understood -- I like the birds.

[Mr. Sorenson presented Dr. Warrack with a picture.]

MR. SORENSON:

But I want you to remember the Noah bit and remember our wildlife. Our wildlife has a history as long as mankind and therefore it has an equal right to the opportunity to survive as long as mankind. Thank you.

DR. WARRACK:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say thank you, personally, and can I break the rules to the House enough to say -- Thank you, Ralph.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take too long tonight, but there are a few remarks I'd like to make with regard to the comments made by the hon. minister. Certainly, I think that many of the new members of the Assembly, that haven't had an opportunity to take the MLA sessions, have appreciated the comments and the outline of the department. I think you have made a professor-type delivery of your talk this evening, and I expect the sessions that were held for the MLA's would have been very informative and beneficial to them. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend, but in listening to this tonight, I well recall the time that I had as Minister of Lands and Forests, and the informative, interesting and rewarding times I had in that department. Certainly, I would commend to all the members of the Assembly who can possibly attend, to take in the forestry tour the minister has mentioned, because to the members of the Assembly who are new, this will be a rewarding and an educational tour. I suggest to the minister that maybe at the next winter session, he provide a hunter training course for the members of the Legislative Assembly, as we did back a few years ago. I won't say how many of the members passed the course, but that's beside the point.

I well recall, as an MLA, taking a tour into the Peace River country, and that's another one that broadens the knowledge of the individual members of many parts of this province. I as well made a forestry tour that took us through much the same area where, I understand, this next tour will be going.

The minister mentioned the staff in the department, and I would echo what he said, and the expertise to guide the judgments in the department were certainly appreciated by me. Certainly, in a renewable resource department such as Lands and Forests, and incidentally as Agriculture is too -- having been minister of both -- I really can't separate them, because they are pretty much the same.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-63

There are differences, certainly, but they are both renewable resource fields, and I think it's a pretty important one for the benefit of the citizens who are living in that area today, and those yet unborn.

We'll certainly have questions as we go on in the various votes. There is one thing I wanted to mention, though, and I found it pretty hard to believe. In looking at the estimates for the Department of Lands and Forests, to see and recognize the emphasis that's been placed on tourism and the emphasis that's been placed on increased park facilities, and then to see the parks development budget cut by some 63.5 per cent, I don't know whether that's a new direction or what it is, but I was disappointed in that part. With that, Mr. Chairman, I think those were the remarks I'd like to make, and I'll be questioning as the debate goes on.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few general remarks on the Department of Lands and Forests estimates. Mainly, I'll dwell on the provincial parks. The way I look at it, I think our parks have not progressed fast enough for the increasing demands that are put upon them. At one time parks were for the use of tents and overnight camping, but the majority of campers use self-contained trailer units, and this has forced provincial parks into a continuous program for catching up, with respect to the provision of facilities. More and more of the public camping grounds are now requesting water and sewer hook-ups, and power installations for trailers, washrooms with electric razor outlets, flush toilets, and shower facilities, all of which are extremely costly. Only two of the 47 developed parks which have been created by the Parks Division enjoyed the luxury of being completed prior to opening to the general public. In many cases, the creation of public parks, or the premature opening of these parks, has been to satisfy political expediency, or to ratify a new public situation such as the planting of fish in an area which has become a major attraction for the general public.

Mr. Chairman, the area that I'll single out is the Chain Lakes Reservoir. This type of situation has resulted in major expenditure for land acquisition, in addition to the provisions of facilities, without the opportunity to provide for proper planning input. We are faced with a few problems in the next few years. Some of these will be separation of existing parks into day use and overnight camping areas. This has taken in the provincial park in the Stony Plain constituency, namely, Wabamun Provincial Park. We have one area which is used for the self-contained units and another area which is used for tents and tent trailers. But we are fast running out of room out there. I'd say about half of the park has still to be developed, but because of the cut-back this year, this will probably not be accomplished. I would foresee this in the next couple of years. But I believe new parks should be planned, designed, tendered, structured and constructed by private enterprise through the use of consultants. Certain planning input such as the concept for use in particular areas can be given to the consultants.

There is one other area I want to dwell on for a few minutes. This is one I brought up in the Order Paper a while ago. This has to do with the fish hatchery in Calgary. I realize that part of this is under Public Works, but it will come under the jurisdiction of Fish and Wildlife under the Department of Lands and Forests once it is completed.

First of all I think the placing of this fish hatchery in the City of Calgary was a wrong move by the previous administration. Going through some of the records that I got from the Department of Public Works, it would appear that the last year's minister of Public Works pushed to have this done. There are different letters that I

48-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

have read through; one is from the Deputy Minister to the Chief Engineer. The first paragraph of the letter states,

"As you know, Mr. Ludwig has been pressing to have the fish hatchery and gearing station processed to tender without minimum delay."

But the plans were only 99% complete. They went ahead anyway. Then the fish hatchery was put out for tender. The lowest tender was accepted. It was given to Commonwealth Construction of Calgary. The letter of confirmation, was sent out to Commonwealth Construction, and when the tender was accepted, the government at that time knew the faults of this company, that they weren't up to actual good building code ethics. In the letter it stated -- and this was sent out by the Minister of Public Works at that time:

"It has been drawn to my attention by the staff of the department that your company's record for unscheduled completion of work on previous contracts with the department left something to be desired. I am taking this opportunity to remind you there is a completion date set for this project which is extremely critical because of the scheduled delivery of the fall of 1972 for the first shipment of fish eggs, for which the hatchery equipment must be completely operational.

"The contract is being awarded to you on the clear understanding that the completion date of October 31, 1972, will be met without fail."

The hatchery is about half done right now. The completion date has been tentatively set for March 1, 1973. I understand there may even be problems getting it done by then.

He goes on to say further in the letter,

"I wish to advise you that I have a keen personal interest in this project, and this interest will continue at all times during the construction phases.

The staff in my department has drawn to my attention a problem in your sub-trades submitted along with your tenders. In it you name your own forces for concrete insulation, and they understand the firm is not a franchise applicator for concrete. It will, therefore, be necessary for you to place this portion of the work in the hands of a sub-contractor who has the properly approved skilled tradesmen to carry out the work."

It goes on further, but there have been problems with many of the sub-trades. I have looked over the file. I don't know why they ever went ahead with this; why they didn't pick another contractor when they knew in the first place that Commonwealth Construction of Calgary was not up to specifications as they should have been. Why didn't they pick one of the other contractors who were second or third lowest?

One other aspect I want to talk about -- decentralization of industry -- is a park furniture factory, which was put into Edmonton Calder constituency out in the Bonaventure Industrial Park. This could have been put into the constituency of Whitecourt. The hon. Member for Whitecourt has said they have no parks or anything up there. The materials and everything are ready there. Lumber is available. Why haul the lumber into the city, and then haul the built furniture back out into the provincial parks? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-65

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, since some of the remarks made by the hon. member who just spoke concern me, I would like to tell him that the tendering procedures of the Department of Public Works that existed during the time I was minister were among the finest in Canada. When the contract was awarded -- and I doubt whether anybody will change them too much -- to this particular firm it was on the advice of perhaps the top engineers in this province, the professional staff of the department and my full knowledge of the terms of the contract and what can be done if a contract is not fulfilled properly. We had no choice under the circumstances but to award the contract as tendered. I'm rather surprised that the hon. member, who just probably has half the facts before him should get up and take the chance of making maligning statements probably displaying more ignorance than knowledge on the whole issue. It was not the decision of the minister alone, but after careful consideration and knowledge and the obligation to accept a tender. I doubt whether I want to just let that kind of remark pass without reply.

On the other hand, if there was something that was not proper or not in the best interests of the people, I believe that the staff in the department continued -- we have a tremendously experienced Public Works staff, and they could advise the present minister whether the contract is, in fact, being fulfilled or not.

On the matter of completion of projects. Everyone in construction knows that even in the best, and sometimes small projects, it's hard to meet deadlines. And you do a specialized program of the nature of the fish hatchery insisting on a deadline and having a contract for a deadline does not mean that you can demand that it be finished on the date. You can expect problems to arise. You can expect weather interruptions, labour interruptions, delivery interruptions, there are many reasons that have to be looked upon with common sense to determine whether you could determine the contract and call for the penalty, or continue.

I believe that not only I, but the Department and the people of this province, ought to be proud in the manner that that whole project was handled and if there was any haste on my part, it's always my attitude that if we can push something along that's been determined, let's get on with it. And I don't believe that the present minister will take a much different attitude.

The best advice I had at the time the contract was awarded was that it was ready to go, and it's no one's intention to ever award a contract if the plans are not completed. Those plans which were required for the commencement of the construction, according to the engineering consultants, were ready and there was no delay whatsoever because of incomplete plans. In the event of some changes needed to be made, that has to be done on the advice of the top consultants. Underwood, McClellan and Associates, are probably the only firm in Western Canada, perhaps in all of Canada, which is capable and competent of being the project manager of a project of this nature.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'm proud of the way that thing was done, and when the whole project is finished, it will be a tremendous asset to the people of this province and a tribute to them for agreeing to pay for such a wonderful project. Thank you.

MR. PURDY:

I'll go on record as being one person not proud of it.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, it looks like we're going to get into the fish hatchery, but as a Member for Calgary, and for that matter, I think everyone in Alberta is pleased that the fish hatchery is going ahead

48-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

wherever it is, and I hope that the thing will be completed, and we'll go on and get a few more fish in our streams.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I know the hon. minister will ask me to mention the wild horses again, because the other day he wasn't taken seriously by the Legislature on a very serious matter. I had a number of questions for the hon. minister regarding the timber quotas, but I believe I'll just send those directly to him by way of a wire, which will probably save time in the House, but I'm concerned with the hon. minister's remarks the other day, because I think one of the local papers quoted the hon. minister as saying he was going to do something to conserve the wild horses.

I just want to bring to the attention of the House the decline in the wild horse population in the province and we're probably not getting our money's worth. If the government is going to insist on getting rid of these wild horses, they at least should get their money out of them, which I don't encourage them to do. I have a report here of the permits that have been issued from 1962 to 1972. Last year, there were 206 of these wild horses captured, and at the present time, a round-up is being carried out west of Sundre which will probably add another 50 to this number. But if you figure it out, all we're getting from each of these wild horses works out to about \$5 a head. It's the cheapest wildlife that you can go out hunting in the whole province.

So, I would like the hon. minister to seriously consider a program, a research program, to see if we cannot stop the hunting and killing of these animals before they become extinct. I feel -- like the hon. member who spoke just a moment ago regarding the grouse and other animals -- I think with the influx, and with the easy way that you can capture these animals now -- although they are well back, away from man, the fact that we have machinery, machines, and aircraft is making it very easy. It is hard for these animals to maintain themselves for too many years. I have many arguments that I could use tonight -- I am not going to bother giving them -- as to why I think that we should do something about this particular animal.

I can only urge that the hon. minister give every consideration, as they have done in the United States, to prohibit the taking, shooting, or maiming of these animals in any way. They are treated as a species that is going to be preserved for the future in the United States, and I think this species should get the same protection here in this country -- all these animals which, in every case, are on public lands, and in most cases, well away from civilization.

#### Contracts and Agreements

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, just on general policy under 'general administration', what is the policy for Lands and Forests in the information sent out to members of the Legislative Assembly?

And, while I am on my feet, I might ask whether or not you would do as the Minister of the Environment has done, in sending to those who requested the copies of the clipping service?

DR. WARRACK:

The news releases that are developed from the Department of Lands and Forests, like the other departments, are handled through the press secretary so that that, once done, is really a government level function rather than an individual department function. But, at the same time, I would really, as sincerely as I possibly can -- and I think a reflection of this is the MLA sessions we are holding

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-67

and the forestry tour wish to expedite and make as easy as possible the distribution of all information that's necessary information for the public, and particularly for those people who represent the public, who, we all know, have a difficult time reading all the material that comes. As much as we can get into concise form and to them, is just so much help.

I would commit myself to all hon. members to work toward that end, and certainly, as was the case respecting that question to other departments, this would certainly be the case at the entire government level in terms of the news releases. I do not myself utilize the clipping service in anything more than a filing way, that you can use to look back on, but we do do this in our own office, with my secretary, because you get the reaction much, much quicker. That is usually what it takes in terms of a news release. So that is how we do it.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, Mr. Chairman, just further to that, to the hon. minister, then, is this the idea, who those members that were interested in having copies of the news items that come over the minister's desk, would have them available, providing they notify you of it?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, they sure will.

MR. BENOIT:

I have two questions to raise of the hon. minister, out of the comments that he made. At one point, the hon. minister said that the Willmore Wilderness Park was neither wilderness nor park, and I think I know what he means, but I would like a little bit more of an explanation of that one.

Then there was another observation that the hon. minister made, where he said that the hunter-owner problem had not been sufficiently faced in the past, as it should have been. I was wondering what he would have suggested to have done two years ago, in the light of public opinion at that time, for that situation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Change the government.

DR. WARRACK:

That was beautiful. Just briefly, respecting Willmore, you know that there is The Willmore Wilderness Act, and it is called "wilderness", but it is not a part of the Wilderness Areas Act. As long as you're taking the view that The Wilderness Areas Act defines, in fact, a wilderness and nothing else does -- because they are very different ... in that sense it is certainly not a wilderness, and it's not a park as a provincial park and certainly not a national park either. It's an entity of itself. The nature of it is much, much different from either of the other two and as you no doubt know, there is really no particular restriction in the legislation on the use of the land there. In fact it's really a designated area rather than a specified use, in terms of land; its specification and name does not reflect in terms of its use.

I don't know if anything is necessary to add on the second part either but I can recall our conversation on February 14th in Calgary with your constituent where, I think we all agreed, what I said was indeed true.

48-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON:

Yes. First of all I would like to commend the hon. minister and his department for touring my constituency with regard to setting up the quotas in the lake areas and talking with the fishermen and the farmers. I think this was a step in a major direction.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order. There is an awful lot of interruption over here from people who are not interested in what is going on and I suggest that at least they have an obligation to keep quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Ludwig. It was mentioned a week ago that it was starting to sound like a knitting bee. Please continue Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON:

I hope you will continue on in that type of approach because it does give a liaison between the fisherman and the mink farmer and establishing the quotas and how they are established. It gives them an insight into what the department, the biologists and the management are up against.

In areas like mine, especially the northern part of the province, when you're letting timber quotas out I'd appreciate it if consideration were given to letting out large parcels on a year round operation. For two-fold reasons; over the years we've had small sawmill operators -- who cut maybe 1 million or 1 1/2 million board-feet -- coming into our community, predominantly from the farming areas. They bring their whole crews in and our residents either have the opportunity of taking what's last offered to them in this type of employment, or staying on welfare. Really, if I was in that position I would rather stay on welfare than work just three or four weeks of the year. But when you're letting quotas out, say on the fringe of a farm area, you could let them out in smaller quotas where the farmers could take advantage of it, and not move into areas like ours or north into McMurray area and Port Vermilion area and High Level area so that we can make them workable units and offer the people of that particular area year-round employment.

The second thing is that we heard quite a lecture on fish plants and I must admit that we tried to lobby for it too. I've come to the conclusion that it is located in the best spot, in Calgary. Because predominantly it is going to serve the Rocky Mountain watershed and that's where the people are. That's about it, Mr. Minister.

Appropriation 1802 total agreed to \$ 816,990

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1803</u>	Advisory Board	\$ 6,200
<u>Appropriation 1804</u>	Technical Division	975,980
<u>Appropriation 1805</u>	Registration	263,970

Appropriation 1815 Forest Administration

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, there was an order in council that came out March 7th, dealing with Section 5 of The Department of Lands and Forests Act, and the heading of the appendix was Department of Lands and Forests Act, Alberta Forest Service. Now changes that were made in that are set out in about 17 points in that. I was just wondering

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-69

what the changes were from what was there previously. Maybe I should leave this with you and you can reply at a later date. ...first annual report and I assume that was the same setup as this is.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, my recollection, and of course it depends if I'm focused in on the right week, is that it deals with a normal updating in terms of the regulations that govern the forest regulations in terms of supply and so forth. But I'd have to look at it, I think, to tell whether I'm accurate in that response. There was one fairly lengthy Order in Council that was of that nature, and I'm not sure whether that was exactly the one or not.

MR. RUSTE:

This is the one that says the Alberta Forest Service shall be divided into six branches to be known -- and it spells them all. And when I compare this to what was in the 21st Annual Report, I find the same. But I can check with it again.

DR. WARRACK:

Oh yes. There were some other parts in it changed and it was necessary to outline the contacts as part of it, so it is as a body of updated regulations. But that is the set of regulations I was thinking of. I think I can assure you that there is nothing particularly major in terms of changes, and that is what you've noted. But it's an updating of some things that help on the administrative area.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, does Appropriation 1805 deal with the registration of surface rights?

DR. WARRACK:

I'd be happy to move back to that appropriation. No, the Registration is basically the compilation and orderly handling of our, oh gosh, I think it's 16,000 files or something like that. We have a whole floor of files and several people who work strictly with that. Just operating that in as fluid a system as possible is what is involved in Registration and that is why it's a separate function. There is a person who has that specific job as a supervisory function.

MR. ZANDER:

May I just say one more thing, Mr. Chairman, that certainly a surface lease that the government only gets \$25 from, doesn't even pay for the registration fees or the type of bookkeeping that we have, and I certainly hope that the Department of Lands and Forests will certainly increase their surface leases to such extent, at least, that they will pay for the operation of the department. Because if it costs \$263,970 with all the leases I can imagine, I think we should at least be on a break-even basis.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, let me just respond very briefly, not so much specifically to that point. As we've discussed privately on other occasions, the hon. member certainly does have a point, and it's a point that I think is a valid one on the revenue side -- which really doesn't, I guess, involve the estimates so much, except that it is important to us. One that involves a major point that is applicable in a number of ways, is in the way that we offer free services at this time to various industries that deal with the Department of

48-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

Lands and Forests because they are involved in some way with Crown lands.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out yesterday, some of these Crown leases ... I refer to the one that I spoke of yesterday, where I imagine there are eight wellsites on this one section of land. All the Crown receives from that is \$250, which is not nearly sufficient to cover the cost of administration. This is the point that I wanted to make at this time.

MR. APPLEBY:

This is on Appropriation 1815. I wanted to make a couple of comments -- is that the one we're on?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes it is. Carry on.

MR. APPLEBY:

I'd just like to add a few comments to some of the things I said on the Throne Speech regarding forestry because when we look at the forestry situation in Alberta, one thing I think we have to express concern about is the allocation of timber as far as the smaller operators are concerned. And I have to disagree with the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake in this respect because I know of one operator at Enilda, and another at Redearth in his constituency who have not operated full-time this winter because they couldn't hire a crew in the area. They have come down as far as Athabasca to look for people to work in their mills, because the people in that area just didn't want to go to work in these mills. There are many other operators in the same situation. I know of one at High Prairie as well, and I could name those for you too.

I have no criticism as far as the forest management policy is concerned. I feel that the timber management quota system is a very good system and I think that it has been very well planned and very well administered here in Alberta. But I do believe that the previous policies in the province didn't have sufficient foresight in making timber quotas available for the so-called smaller operators -- people who wanted to saw maybe up to five million feet or six million feet a year. Many of the quotas that were sold, were sold in the easily accessible areas to concerns with extensive financing and they were able to out-bid the smaller operators I referred to for timber stands in these easily accessible areas. Once these smaller people were squeezed out, then they could buy more timber, of course, the bigger finance people, because they wouldn't have to pay such a high price for it afterwards.

So you might say that timber is gone, now what can be done. I think that is what we have to look at now. I don't think it was a very far-sighted policy and what can we do about it in the future? I think that there are two or three things that we have to keep in mind and one of them is that some of the more remote tracts of timber should be opened up and made available to the smaller operators. One of the problems here, of course, is road construction because if a person is not sufficiently financed and they don't have the assets, they can't go and build 30 or 40 or 50 miles of road in some of these fairly rugged terrain areas that the timber is in. So if they could get some help in the matter of road construction and smaller amounts of timber were made available to them, then they could run an economically successful operation.

Of course, one thing that we will hear spoken about when we start talking about timber resources, is the fact that the smaller

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-71

operator does not run an economical operation as far as total recovery of the wood from the timber stand is concerned. We are told that some of the smaller operators only recover maybe 45 per cent of the commercial timber that is being cut, whereas a more intensified operation may recover as high as 75 per cent of the timber. I think this may be so. In order to recover such a large amount of timber, of course, they have to have debarkers and the edgings and the slabs go through a chipper and it is made into chips and that is eventually used in a pulp operation elsewhere. It is shipped out.

But there is another point that has been argued about for years, and that is whether the clear-cut method of forest harvesting is the best method to use. In recent years the trend has been to allow very heavy equipment into the bush, D-8 cats, and heavy machines, heavy tree farmers, and so on. When they are through the place is just flat and bare and a lot of the smaller growth, timber that might be 15 or 20 years old has been actually mutilated so it is no longer going to grow. We might wonder, then, whether the total cut salvaged is actually the fullest amount that could have been recovered from that timber stand had not these logging methods been used.

Another thing I think we should take a very careful look at now, Mr. Chairman, is the matter of our aspen or our poplar stands, because I think that in the next few years, there is going to be probably a tremendous development in the use of this wood. I think that we have to make sure of the method by which this is harvested, and the people that is made available to is a very important consideration. I know that in some of these operations, many of the incentive programs that the Government of Alberta and the federal government have, poured millions of dollars in to set up operations for timber manufacture. Plywood logs have been taken out and sawmills, planers, and so on have operated. One of the things to consider is they are pouring millions of dollars into these areas and the idea is eventually to create employment. Then you go into one or two of these operations and you talk to the people and management in these operations and the biggest thing they try to impress you about is how automated their operations are and how few men they are going to have to use. This is the big factor. The smaller operators, definitely, will use more people and perhaps they won't recover as much of the wood, but I think you have to balance things out if we are trying to create employment. Maybe we will have to sacrifice a little bit of wood to do that -- as long as we can maintain our supplies in a perpetual manner. I think this is going to be highly important. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Just before Mr. Dixon starts, I would advise for the hockey fans that Boston won, 3 - 0.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, there's only one question I wish to direct to the hon. minister. In going through the Budget Address as far as timber rentals and fees are concerned, it shows \$4,300,000 income, and the expenditures of the Department of Lands and Forests are estimated at \$5,456,000. The reason for my question is that at the present time, the lumber industry is in a very buoyant position. There are good prices compared to what they have been and there is good demand. I was wondering if the government has any plans to review the stumpage and the royalty payments. While The minister is answering this question, could he tell me the difference between the sliding scale they use in British Columbia as far as royalty and stumpage is concerned and the system in Alberta?

48-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, I won't be able to give a complete answer, because I don't have a familiarity with the way they are handling it in British Columbia. I'm not at the moment planning a review in this area. The hon. member didn't really indicate whether he felt it should be a review upward, or downward, but in either case I think if one does a review, one should look at both possibilities. If there was an expression of viewpoint among people in Alberta generally, and people particularly representing other people in Alberta, this would be something we could very well do. I've not really had much indication that there is need for review in that area.

To move on, though, and explain very, very briefly, basically how the royalties are computed -- they are computed, really, with two criteria. One is a cost analysis that is done on a biennial basis, and that's a structural base for computing royalties. That goes into a formula for a considerable period of time. The second part which is a formula gradient, related to the timber price comes into effect, and the prices move up and down on the basis of the paramount price. And recently, as you mentioned, the prices have been very, very good in contrast to what they were a couple of years ago. Considering that, it's likely that we may, if anything, be slightly higher on revenues in terms of timber dues than is reflected in the estimates, although I'm not nearly as fully prepared to discuss the revenue side as the expenditure side -- my understanding being that the estimates really involved the expenditure side of the budget, primarily.

Finally, I just don't know the system in British Columbia, myself, but we have some people in the department who certainly do, and I'd be most happy to arrange that kind of an opportunity on an individual basis, if you'd like.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I just have a very brief comment, and then a brief question to the minister. Last year and the year before that there was some discussion in the Department of Lands and Forests -- especially the Forestry Division, I think the discussion primarily emanated out of the Bow Forestry office in Calgary -- of the possibility of closing the Red Deer Ranger Station and the James Ranger Station. I'd like to re-emphasize the representation that I made on a number of occasions to your predecessor that, frankly, I would be very disappointed if the James Ranger Station or the Red Deer Ranger Station in the northern portion of the Bow Forest Reserve were closed. I think if the minister checks back, he'll certainly find there is strong representation from people in that particular portion of the province for the maintenance of those two stations.

I should further say that some of the reasoning, as was explained to me by forestry people, was that there would be some advantage in centralizing. For the life of me, I can't understand the advantage in centralizing and yet having to have people go from the central location back to where the stations are now to look after that area.

So with those rather direct and pointed comments, I would ask the minister if the department is giving any consideration to that, and if that is so, that some time before a decision is made on that, would the minister and some of his senior officials from the Forestry Division come down to that area. I'd be pleased to arrange a meeting for you to discuss it with the people in the area. There are some extremely strong feelings, and I feel it would be a very serious mistake. I made that kind of representation even more strongly to your predecessor.

It was for that reason that that exchange took place, in order to accommodate a better access to smaller, local people while at the same time not disadvantaging the larger Federated co-op -- as it is



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-73

in this particular case -- operate and manage timber supply needs on a sustained yield basis. The transaction or exchange was made for that purpose. I think it's a rather important thing.

Appropriation 1815 total agreed to \$4,692,035

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1816</u>	Timber Management	\$ 716,840
<u>Appropriation 1817</u>	Quota Reforestation	195,000

Appropriation 1818 Silviculture

MR. FUSTE:

On this, there's a substantial cut. Maybe the hon. minister will outline what's involved here -- I believe 29% on 1818.

DR. WARRACK:

We did take care of 1817, did we? I was thinking in that direction at the time. I've got some additional back-up detail if it's wanted. 1818 is basically, almost completely the Faust Project, which is a federal-provincial situation, and the area that's involved here is that, and that is basically all of a significant nature that's involved in that.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, can I go into this in a little more detail? What areas are you cutting back in the Faust project, and is this particular project cost-sharing?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, I should have sat down when you stood up. I apologize. Yes, this is involved with the ARDA agreement, and it's still not resolved as of this time. This time, meaning in my back-up information, May 3, and it's simply not there in terms of the federal side. So it's in suspension for that reason.

MR. BARTON:

So the cutback of roughly \$280,000 on other expenses is the Faust project.

DR. WARRACK:

Basically, that's correct. If the agreement itself is resolved, the time frame of expenditures would go like this: in 1972 roughly, \$303,500; 1973 roughly \$250,000, 1974 roughly \$200,000, 1975 roughly \$150,000. This would be the time frame of expenditures on that project, respecting the central Alberta land use co-op if the agreement goes.

MR. BARTON:

You're suggesting that the federal government is backing out of the program?

DR. WARRACK:

I hope not. It's just not firm, that's all.

MR. BARTON:

Are there any other avenues that the co-op can go, other than mass unemployment and the people back on welfare?

48-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

DR. WARRACK:

I'm sorry, I really don't have a response to that. I'm reasonably optimistic that it will go, but that's really as far as I could accurately go I think.

MR. BENOIT:

I'm not sure that it's in this vote, but we're on the subject now and I think that the hon. minister might be able to answer with regard to future policy about reforestation in general. I have here in my hands part of a report that was made to the Calgary paper which was headlined, I would appreciate, not in the tone the report intended -- but the pertinent paragraph says that reforestation is a major responsibility of the Department and one that's not been kept up over the recent years, and then there's an explanation with regard to the fact what has been taken out has been reforested, but not what was burnt. Now, is it the government's intention in the future to have a real stepped-up program in here and reforest all that has burnt as well as what has been taken out? What is the policy for the future in this regard?

DR. WARRACK:

Am I ever glad you asked, because at some point I'll be making a proposition to the people of Alberta, basically to do a step-up in this area of reforestation.

The report is substantially accurate, and I would guess it was about the end of February 1972, subsequent to my remarks at the Fish and Game Association convention, February 26, at Calgary.

The position is basically this. We have cut a certain amount. The reforestation, by a relatively small margin, does exceed the extent of cut, but it does not exceed it enough to anything like offset the amount of fire damage. Our fallback position is on the order of 50,000 acres per year. That is one thing.

The second thing is that, before we were really into a thorough fire suppression business -- and I say that with no criticism at all. We have a lot more technology we can use now than we had before. There had been a considerable amount of burn-out that had not been reforested. So there is the basic problem left, before we approach the year-by-year relatively small fallback position. The two between them, I think, make a fairly serious kind of situation in Alberta, and will become more than fairly serious, but very serious, in the future -- particularly when we consider the non-timber forest use, as well as the physical value of the timber resource, looking into the future.

I appreciate your bringing that point forward, as a matter of fact, because it focuses on something important, and something that I will be back to you all for some support in the future, I think.

MR. BENOIT:

Is there anything in this vote, for this type of work, I mean in this year's appropriation, and is there any plan for this coming year, immediately, or are we looking into the future for this?

DR. WARRACK:

There is some extent of it, as far as this year is concerned related to the STEP program, but that is relatively minor in terms of the total proposition, so I think it would be fair to say that, really, it is a future thing.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-75

MR. DRAIN:

I have noticed that in British Columbia they have opted for burning as a method of forest reproduction, and I am quite surprised to hear that there are considerable areas in Alberta where we do not have a take. I would be very interested in knowing -- a take of reproduction due to burning -- of forest reproduction, the natural reproduction as a result of the exposure of mineral soil and the change of environment. I am quite surprised to hear that this is a situation that exists in Alberta, and I would be interested in knowing in what particular areas this situation does exist.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, I am glad you brought that up. If there is any confusion remaining, I am not in any sense suggesting that all areas that are burned should be counted as a deficit or a fallback area in terms of reforestation. I think it is a netting proposition, in terms of the gross loss, plus the comeback that ensues in a reasonable period of time which, as you know probably better than I do, is about seven years. And so then you are in a net position of the two, and that is a deficit position of a certain magnitude, and that having accumulated over some years, particularly in the 40's and 50's, there is some considerable catch-up that might be necessary.

This is primarily in the more northerly parts of the forest supply area of Alberta. Again, I think this is largely because of two reasons. One is the geographic removal of the area from the logistics that it takes to handle these sorts of problems and, secondly, the value of the timber resource in that area is probably not quite what it is in certain other areas. As most members probably realize, in the far northern area of Alberta we really have a semi-arid climate, almost comparable to the south-east part of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, just further to a question raised by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake concerning the Faust project. I was a little concerned at the hon. minister's answer, and perhaps I would just like to follow that up for a moment.

As you wind down the reforestation project, are you giving any consideration to auctions for the Central Land Use Co-op in Faust? Because it clearly is a case we should be concerned about, Mr. Minister. The people working for the Land Use Co-op are themselves determined to stay off welfare, and I think that this is a very laudable objective that all the members of this Assembly would wholeheartedly endorse. But in order to do that, there has to be something in the future for the Land Use Co-op. So my question to you directly is, are you undertaking any feasibility study as to the areas that would be open to the Land Use Co-op which could keep these people employed in the years ahead?

DR. WARRACK:

Let me respond more broadly and then be a bit more specific in what I hope will be at least a partially-satisfactory answer, Mr. Chairman. More broadly, I think, in the way the operation was planned and handled it is rather clear that the CALUC, Central Alberta Land Use Co-operative, was really made far too dependent on one source of funding -- namely on the ARPA program -- and I think that's got to be a design mistake. The fruits of this problem are upon us to some extent right now in the event that this program doesn't go forward. So that's my broad comment and we've had some discussion about this within the department and it is certainly my feeling -- and shared by others who have responsibilities in this forest supply area -- that the extent of dependency ought to be lessened in the interests of all, and especially the local people.

48-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

Now, more specifically, this is part of the Slave Lake forest which is one of the 11 forests that are in Alberta. There's about \$81,500 scheduled for expenditure in the Slave Lake forest and a considerable amount of this, on the order of \$65,000, will be available regardless for reforestation work and there's no reason why the Co-op could not be a significant part of that in the event that this situation falls upon us.

MR. BARTON:

When you mention the STEP program, is that in the form of transplanting seedlings? Or are you moving away from the approach of transplanting seedlings? When a fire goes through the only reason it comes up thick is the fact that the cones break loose and the seed comes free. Is the STEP going to continue in another area of collecting cones and breaking it down -- because I think, when it comes down to economics on the basis of cost of reforesting areas that have been fired, the actual plane going over and spreading the seed is a lot better than running through and dropping these trees that have a very poor 'catch' ratio.

DR. WARRACK:

I think that's a technical question to which I don't have the answer. I suspect you know more about reforestation than I do. If there is some technical dispute in this area I think it would be really productive for people with different views on how to do this job to get together and I would invite that.

MR. BARTON:

Getting back to the STEP program. Where does it fit into this particular reforestation appropriation?

DR. WARRACK:

Well I'm not sure exactly how much of it is going to be used specifically for reforestation. That may depend on a number of other matters, too, but my recollection is that there is \$225,000 of our \$575,000 to the Department of Lands and Forests. It will go to the Forestry Division.

MR. BARTON:

To follow it up. How is it going to be implemented through STEP? Are you going to ...

DR. WARRACK:

Do you mean right handed, or left handed or what? I don't know.

MR. BARTON:

Are you going to employ people within the area or are you going to bring them in through the program to reforest? How does the STEP program relate to reforestation in my particular area?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, I think now it would be talking in terms of the way you hire people and so on, and so the question should fall on the person in charge of the STEP program at the appropriate time, and that's the hon. minister Bob Dowling.

Appropriation 1818, agreed to

\$ 579,570

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-77

Appropriation 1819 Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this, realizing there have been a lot of changes taking place within the Department of Lands and Forests, particularly in the forestry section since the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board was established, I understand there is a termination of that unless it is renewed. Does the hon. minister have any comments on the status of that at this time?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board will finish its 25-year time frame of planning and operation on March 31, 1973. At this time, there is no federal financial input into this. As you know there once was, in terms of watershed, roadbuilding and so forth. This is no longer the case, it is strictly provincial money and we have begun the anticipation of the March 31, 1973 date now so there is a proper wind-down and no one is disadvantaged in the process.

Appropriation 1819, agreed to \$ 67,610

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1820 Forest Land Use \$ 318,090  
Appropriation 1821 Forestry Maintenance 2,466,635

Appropriation 1822 Fire Control

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, under this appropriation what I'm particularly interested in at this time is the type of plane that we're using in case of fire. And I understand that some of these planes that are hired, although they are Canadian-based, are American contracts. I also understand that some of the service personnel in these planes are American mechanics. Am I right or wrong?

DR. WARRACK:

I'm sorry -- I didn't hear the very last part.

MR. ZANDER:

The mechanics servicing these planes in case of fire -- they are personnel from the United States -- are they not? They bring their own servicing personnel in from the States.

DR. WARRACK:

No. I'm sorry -- I've never heard of such a thing. That's just not right.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Possibly the hon. minister could reply to that later.

DR. WARRACK:

Incidentally the fire control and the operational aspects and logistics of fire fighting is really 1823. 1822 is basically the planning and the simulated operations and preparations for the season.

MR. BARTON:

On this particular appropriation ... is it a decrease in the weather observer tower men, or is this the area you're going to cut

48-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

tower data back? Because I think the Departments of Lands and Forests weather data is more up to date than what you get from the meteorological branch of the federal government.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, actually it is exactly precise. What it is -- it's disaggregated -- or if you like -- less aggregated geographically and chronologically as well. So that the situation is that in a relatively gross or aggregate weather analysis, such as one would have to do when you're doing it for a region of the province like the federal people at the International Airport, you can have shifts of wind and even precipitation within that area that you can't detect. This becomes critical in fire-fighting because you can get a turn back in the wind, and you can actually have it endangering peoples' lives by not detecting that kind of thing on a very decentralized basis. So it's that kind of thing that has the primary emphasis. Rather than quickness, it's the localization of the weather analysis and short term forecast that is the focus of the weather operations by our own meteorologists within 1822.

MR. BARTON:

Then there will be no cut-back in that type of service among the tower men then?

DR. WARRACK:

No.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the hon. minister to explain in a little more detailed way the reduction in the collection of fire weather data. He gave us a good discussion of perhaps what is involved, but I wanted to know just what the cut-back is, what constitutes the cut-back in this particular appropriation.

DR. WARRACK:

Well, I'm sure you've noticed throughout the entire budget that one of the areas that has been cutback rather dramatically and can readily be cutback dramatically, is equipment. If you compare the cut-back in the top line with the total cut-back, you'll find that that particular component which is the furnishings and equipment component is more of a cut-back than the total. It's the major explanation for the difference along with the materials and supplies that would be of a similar nature.

Appropriation 1822, agreed to

\$ 289,940

Appropriation 1823 Fire Suppression

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Chairman, water bombing is probably the most effective method of dealing with a fire in its initial stages. I think that when a fire starts to crown or move, any effectiveness that a water bomber has is totally destroyed, because it can't develop a sufficient volume of water. The thoughts of not using water bombers would be something that would be totally unacceptable to the public, because they would immediately construe that Lands and Forests were back in the horse and buggy days. So therefore, you use water bombers whether you can use them effectively or not, just on sort of a public relations deal.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-79

I believe there is a role for bombing on fire fronts where fires are crowning. This may be thrown out as an idea that should be researched and it possibly may sound slightly ridiculous, but I have given it some thought and I have related to my personal experience in this particular matter. I would suggest that some research could be done in the matter of actually bombing fire fronts with explosives. There has been a suggestion fielded that the federal government would make available, at some point in time, bombers for fire fighting. Certainly the conventional method of using water bombers on a large fire front is simply ridiculous. I have seen them come over and they say 'get under the trees, you are going to get wet', and there wouldn't be a drop that hit the ground, despite the bentonite and everything else. This is something that I just throw out in the hope that this will plant a seed of thought and someone, somewhere would possibly research this.

DR. WARRACK:

I don't think you are necessarily wanting me to respond, but let me very briefly mention that the area you discuss was one of the areas -- I was able to attend at least part of the conference in Denver last week -- on the nature and alternatives to conflagration, one of which is 'wildcat fire'. There is a fantastic amount of research that is going on, quite a bit of it by the way as a spin-off from the Viet Nam war.

MR. DRAIN:

That's right.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, and this is going on now. The second reason I respond with regard to this, Mr. Chairman, is that two weeks ago yesterday, I had the opportunity to sit as an examiner on a master of business administration exam from the Department of Business Administration and Commerce at the university. There a research project was done specifically on the logistics handling and a simulator model for the Footner Lake Forest -- a model which, as it turns out, developed so that it would be usable on a group of forests, or on all forests at once, for the operational logistics that would be involved in this kind of operation. I thought I would mention that in case it was of your interest to follow it up further.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, is it true that there are contracts with water bombers that are still in existence from the previous government? Are they by tender or are they by contract for a certain number of years, if there are any? Are they American?

DR. WARRACK:

As I said before, they are not American. I expect that there certainly would be some contracts in existence now that were in existence before August, if only because a number of these contracts, particularly for more major kinds of operations, are made on more than an annual basis, because it provides the investment that a firm has to make and the planning that it can then do to lessen the cost of providing the service. So there are a number of contracts that, in fact, are handled on a three-year basis for that reason, and would still be in existence.

MR. ZANDER:

Are these contracts then with American companies or are they Canadian?

48-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, they are Canadian.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I noticed he has a note on here that they eliminate the need for special warrants. I can recall that we had a nominal amount in and whenever we came to a special warrant there was sort of a red signal flag to the public that there was a danger for fire and so on. Can the hon. minister give us an assurance that it won't exceed this amount listed here?

DR. WARRACK:

You've got to be smiling when you say that. It is probably a little over-enthusiastic to say 'well . . .' -- no we do so eliminate it. You tried to trick me there. . .[laughter]. . .

You've just got to notice that all these years \$550,000 has been budgeted for forest fires, and last year it was \$5.8 million and the year before \$4.5 million, the year before that \$2.8 million, and the year before that \$5.5 million -- and so on it goes, from page 57 of the annual report. The budgeting that was done was on the assumption that there wouldn't be any forest fires at all, I guess, because it would cost this much to run your operations if there were no fires, basically.

Anyway, the way I approached this, just for your information, was, I asked myself the question and then asked the people who have the knowledge in this area the question: what figure would we be 90 per cent sure we'd have to spend in the summer of 1972 for fire-fighting? And that figure, after considerable discussion and consensus was \$3 million. So instead of budgeting \$550,000 for fire-fighting in 1972, we budgeted \$3 million.

MR. RUSTE:

Just one final question on that to the minister. Don't you think there's some merit in having brought to the attention, through special warrants, the hazards involved? I think there's two lines of thought in this, granted, but I just raised that.

DR. WARRACK:

With all due respect, I do think that's pretty minor.

MR. BARTON:

Replying to the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, on these fire bombers, I think what he's really getting at is that they are on a three-year contract, and the reason for this -- it's sound and I'd like to express my views on it -- is that when the fire starts, the available bombers may not necessarily be in western Canada -- there may be a hot spot in Newfoundland and all the bombers are down there -- so in this case, the actual contracts are just a holding number of hours, I think. They are guaranteed so many hours a year, so that they are within the province to cover the hot spots in particular areas of the province. I think this should be continued.

Appropriation 1823, agreed to \$3,000,000

Appropriation 1825 Aircraft Operations

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on that, could the minister give us some information on the amount of revenue anticipated to be received from



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-81

other areas than within the department itself in this field? You've noted that there's an off set from revenues accruing from other areas. If you haven't got it, you may just supply it to me later.

DR. WARRACK:

Actually, I doubt if I have it in sufficient detail, unless the Provincial Treasurer has something...

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I have the revenue if the member will repeat the question.

MR. RUSTE:

It's dealing with vote 1825, in which it mentions that they are partially off set by revenues accruing to its operation and I was just wondering if I could have a statement on the amount of that.

MR. MINIELY:

If you go on, I'll pick that up and provide it to you.

Appropriation 1825, agreed to \$ 750,160

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1826</u>	Communications	\$ 565,790
<u>Appropriation 1828</u>	Forest Technology School	359,060
<u>Appropriation 1829</u>	Junior Forest Rangers	74,930

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready with your answer, Mr. Provincial Treasurer?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, the revenue from aircraft operations in Lands and Forests is of two categories -- maps, plans and aerial photographs, which are sold through the Atlas of Alberta, which is \$150,000, and the rental of aircraft, totalling \$60,000.

Appropriation 1835 Fish and Wildlife

MR. MANDEVILLE:

I would just like to make some suggestions. Since the minister is going to be drawing regulations for hunting, I would suggest two changes in the regulations for chinese pheasant hunting. One of the problems we're facing is the two seasons that we have every fall. We have the one season that is early, and later on we have a second season. They tell us that this is not the reason for the depleting of our pheasant, but being from Brooks, down in the centre of our pheasant country, knowing the habits of the pheasants, I certainly think this is one regulation that should be changed. The hunter comes out and hunts the pheasants in the first season, and as soon as the hunters leave, the pheasants come back out to feed.

They are a really smart bird. When the hunters come in the second season, the pheasants are driven out and don't come back in until after the storm drives them in, or they stay out a long while. It is not really our hunters who are depleting our population of pheasants, it is the condition they go into during the winter. It is the second season that is causing a lot of problems as far as depleting our pheasant population is concerned. I hope the hon. minister will look at a change here, and change it to one season.

48-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

Maybe we could extend the one season a little bit longer. I am certain it would be much more beneficial than having the two seasons.

Another regulation that I hope we will have changed was one that was brought in last year on a temporary basis; and that was, the hunting of our hen pheasants. I have nothing to back it up that this is going to deplete our pheasant population, but just looking at the Hungarian partridges in which you can't determine the sex of the bird, they are depleting; you don't see many any more. I can remember years ago when we could see many Hungarian partridges around.

Another bird that is almost extinct now is the prairie chicken. I think that is the result as well of not being able to determine the sex. I think this is also one of the reasons our prairie chickens are depleting. I strongly feel we should not harvest the female chinese pheasants.

I would ask the hon. minister, while he is reviewing the regulations, to take a look at these two changes.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to support what the hon. member has said with regard to pheasants. I felt that the policy made with regard to hen pheasants, and with regard to the second season, has not been a good one for the pheasant population in that part of Alberta.

DR. WARRACK:

Regarding your first point, Mr. Mandeville, I think maybe the way to handle it is if you would be kind enough to give me a memo -- and I mean very shortly, because I am upon these decisions -- on your feelings on the first point you made so I can make sure I have it properly, and discuss it and consider it.

Regarding pheasants, specifically, I do know that last year the female pheasant season was allowed to run on through and concurrent with the male. I did get a lot of representation about that, starting two or three days before I got in the office. There was quite a bit of problem there. The problem basically, as all people who are acquainted with this area will know, is that particularly late in the season, when you get on towards winter, the female population particularly tends to covey; so that it doesn't migrate nearly so much when you take a shot at them, they don't migrate so much. Also they are grouped, you might shoot clusters of them. That indeed is a problem.

It is not my understanding that all of the birds you mentioned are as short as you indicate, but if I could try to be facetious for a moment -- if the male can't figure out the sex then we are really going to be in trouble.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Chairman, my concern is in the wildlife end of this vote. I made a brief to your department, Mr. Minister, some time ago, as to regulations in moose hunting and grizzly bear hunting. Can you tell me if this will be considered? This brief comes from a number of my fish and game members and offices throughout Whitecourt, Barrhead, Edson, and so on. This was done in February, I believe. Can you tell me if it will be looked into?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, it might be worthwhile to review basically how we handle all of these. I have mentioned on a number of occasions that we have

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-83

a Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council, to which we refer all recommendations, compiling them up to the time they are about to meet. I can certainly assure all hon. members that the nature of recommendations are considered division-wise, and considered in terms of our Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council.

I don't want to let the cat out of the bag, in terms of things we ought to do in alterations regarding any particular species, partly because final decisions on this have not really been made by me. I have been busy preparing for estimates. If I did give an answer I would be in danger of being a little bit imprecise about it, because of not having the details on hand. But I can certainly assure you it has been considered.

MR. BARTON:

While we're on Fish and Wildlife, I have one of my pet topics, and that is we have national parks, and in the national parks we don't touch any of the resources. We have provincial parks and we limit touching resources, but we haven't any lakes that we could call provincial lakes where the nets are being eliminated, and where we can say twenty years from now, a net hasn't been in that lake. I was wondering if your department was considering moving in that avenue to eliminate some of the total net fishing of the lakes that we have in Alberta. For instance, I have a lake in my area with a quota of trout of 2,000 pounds. It dictates to the balance of the quotas in the whitefish and the jack and the pickerel. So that lake -- and it's Peerless Lake -- I'll go on record as supporting if you do close it totally, and leave it for future generations' recreational purposes.

MR. MILLER:

I'd like to strongly recommend that we don't lift -- open the season -- for hen pheasants. If your department hasn't had strong representation all over the province, the MLA's certainly have. Everywhere we go, this is one sore spot. They don't want the season open for hen pheasants.

DR. WARRACK:

I want to thank you Mr. Miller, I favour late -- as far as the hen pheasant season is concerned -- late in the season; and, that's right, I've had representations also. I do want to say Mr. Chairman, that I think the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake -- I got the Lesser one that time, I forgot it before, -- Lesser Slave Lake makes a very positive suggestion, and if it's done, I know I'll need his support. I felt the representations from the other viewpoint as well.

While I'm at it, the main reason why I thought I would respond at this point, is that I guess you're aware we do have a trophy lake program on a three-year experimental program, and I shouldn't really say 'we'. I think this was a very useful thing -- it was begun, initiated, by the previous administration -- with seven trophy lakes, the idea being to try to make that alteration in concept from the maximization idea of harvest to an optimization, where you consider the quality of the experience, be it hunting, or in this case, be it fishing. That's what is being striven for in the trophy lake program; which is, as I say, a three-year experimental program going into the third year. The results of that will have a great deal of influence on where we ought to go with this program, whether it should be held or whether it should go forward, in for example, I think he said Peerless Lake. But that is a very positive suggestion.

48-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

MR. RUSTE:

Three points here I'd like to raise -- maybe I'll raise them then. First one, I've received some representation on having received a poor response from the Fish and Wildlife Division in regard to obtaining films, brochures for courses that they promote in various local fish and game associations who have put on courses. This indicates to me that they had a poor response; and I'm just wondering if there's been any change in that field, because I understood that we had these hunter training programs, we had information going out to the various fish and game associations particularly, and other interested people.

The second point is dealing with the case we had last fall of the American hunters who came in. Did you, as a minister, consider appealing that case? As I understood it, they were only fined for about 50 per cent of the maximum? I think a return that was tabled in this Assembly today indicated that it was almost non-existent to wherever the courts have taken the maximum amount that is in existence at this time.

The third point gets back to the answer that you gave the other day on the matter of the senior citizens sixty-five and over. I'm just looking at this in relation to what the Department of Highways is doing, in not requiring examinations. The two don't really add up to me, and I'm just asking if you've given any consideration to that.

DR. WARRACK:

On the first point, I've really run into very little negative feedback on the way the publications and so forth are handled. Distribution is something I feel strongly about, so I would give the assurance that I would do the best that I could and that, in turn, we as a Department and we as a Division would do the best we can to get that information out to people quickly.

To the third point before the second, if I might, Mr. Chairman, I think I mentioned that there were the safety considerations; and I think that is the point where you feel there is a degree of inconsistency; there is the safety consideration involved. And then, secondly, the fact that hunting is really a pretty physical kind of experience, in contrast to fishing. It was the feeling that these were some reasons to not necessarily go forward in terms of the senior citizen alleviation of the hunting license.

Now, to point two. This is something I looked at pretty clearly and, of course, the opportunity would present itself on third reading of Bill 8, but the way it works is this, basically. As was described so well by the hon. Attorney-General in a previous matter of debate earlier in the House, it is just as essential that a penalty that is involved be a deterrent, and that the penalty that is levied be felt fair by the person who is imposed with the penalty -- just as critical, on any kind of an enforcement. All right, looking at it that way, then from -- if you are sitting on the bench, and you have an array of people involved, for example, in the Valleyview situation with the moose hunters -- and by the way, not all of the worst offenders were Americans; I wasn't so much saying that to you as the fact that there is that general misunderstanding around -- but then you have to look from the judge's bench and say, "who is most guilty?" and if that is applied as the maximum -- and it was, in that case -- then you really have to scale the other penalties in accordance to differentiate the degree of guilt. So when you add all of that up, it turns out that you have a total administration of the penalty, in that particular case, on the order of 55 or 60 per cent of the maximum possible.

But to have had the absolute maximum possible would have involved using the maximum penalty on, if you like, the least guilty person as well as the most guilty. Certainly that wouldn't be fair. Now, I think you would be prepared to argue, and I would be prepared

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-85

to argue, that, really, it did seem a little light. But, nevertheless, I can respect that concept in the fair administration of justice. Basically the barrier that stands before us in that case, is the barrier of having a high-enough maximum to go to, with the worst offenders, and from which to differentiate fairly among the others.

It is that sequence of thinking that was the background in our discussions among all the people I consulted, and, particularly, the hon. member who is handling the bill, in terms of making the decision to go -- as we are about 250 or 300 per cent increase in the maximum penalties to the Wildlife Act.

MR. RUSTE:

Just one final one on the matter of the senior citizens, those over 65. I submit that among many of those people who come to retirement, there have been those who are interested in hunting past 65, have no doubt done it prior to reaching that age. I would submit that this is something that would be a real help to them, in having this available to them beyond 65, because they usually quit their active work as such, and in their retirement, these are forms of activity that they can enjoy and benefit from. I ask you to reconsider it on that basis.

DR. WARRACK:

I find that a persuasive argument.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the fishing and hunting by people over age 65, I would like to express my appreciation to the hon. minister for his written reply to my question in the Question Period one day. In this reply, he mentioned that one of the reasons that it is not possible to provide free hunting licenses for people 65-and-over, is the fact that it involves the federal government and the provincial government. Before we are able to do away with this license fee, we would then need the co-operation of the federal government, and also the provincial government, because it does involve, I think, a \$2 duck stamp as we call it.

Coming to my feet again tonight, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the hon. minister if any consideration has been given, by your department or by the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, to discussion of this matter with the federal government to see if there is any possibility that, possibly, some co-operation down the line, could bring mutual agreement to provide these extra benefits for our people 65-and-over, with respect to hunting.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is quite right. Respecting any of the migratory birds, for example ducks, it is necessary that it be a joint provincial-federal matter. I did not take the trouble to mention that particular detail in my response to Mr. Ruste but, we could not as a province unilaterally do that now.

I would really welcome the thoughts of all the members of the Assembly and if there is feeling that major effort ought to be made to try to arrange this, I would certainly be prepared to try to go ahead and do it.

MR. FRENCH:

Before we really get into this vote, I would like to make representation for a wildlife officer down in east-central Alberta. We have a very large area where the hunting in the fall is considered

48-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

the best hunting for Canada geese in Alberta and we also have extensive fishing at the Blood Indian Dam, which I'm sure the hon. minister is aware of. But yet we have no permanent wildlife officer in that area. I realize the last two or three years we've had a temporary officer, in the fall of the year, but I think the time is coming when we should have a full-time officer to look after fishing in the summertime, and hunting in the fall, and other activities.

In this connection we do have a large number of American hunters who come up who are having some problems to get their game marked for export. Not that this is a real reason to have an officer, because I think we should look after people first but, at the same time, if we are going to charge these large licence fees for out-of-country hunters we should at least provide some element of service to them.

DR. WARRACK:

I don't think there is any question but what the future holds the need for additional enforcement staff in Fish and Wildlife. I don't want to over-emphasise at this point because I think there are some other ways that we can look at this as well. Certainly it's not all on the hunting side in terms of any wildlife we might have. It's also a matter of the problem on the habitat side, particularly the habitat confines that most wildlife need for their reproduction. I think there's a very strong possibility that we might, in the rather immediate future, need to have a more affirmative or more positive-oriented wildlife management and fisheries management; legislation oriented towards management, including habitat, instead of looking at it strictly on the negative or penalty side. So I do want to take this opportunity to make that point and, secondly, make another point that we can do even more quickly and that is, I think we can cross-reference by interfacing some of our enforcement staff particularly in parks and forestry, as well as fish and wildlife, to help each other cut on a cross-divisional basis.

A second part to that which makes sense to me, Mr. Chairman, is to utilize, particularly, some of the technician people as temporary enforcement officers. My view being that you can work together so much better, if you have the thorough understanding of the other man's job and the other man's problem that comes from having to face it on a daily basis yourself. I think all of these things are ways that we can help what is a fairly acute problem as you point out now and I take this opportunity to reveal my thinking to you on this.

Appropriation 1835 total agreed to \$2,287,830

Appropriation 1836 Wildlife Damage Control

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on that; has there been any further progress in negotiations or any information from the federal government on their contribution towards the damage to crops -- or maybe we could have that later?

DR. WARRACK:

What I would say at this point, and happy to provide detail and more appropriate circumstance, is, that it looks like its 'go', and on this Crop Depredation Program on a federal-provincial basis with Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba; that it will be a program that gets the green light from the federal side and this will help us a very great deal.

MR. RUSTE:

A shared program?

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-87

DR. WARRACK:

Yes.

Appropriation 1836, agreed to \$ 10,000

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1845 Lands Branch \$1,584,620

Appropriation 1846 Provincial Parks

MR. BARTON:

Are you continuing on with parks access road paving. Is this in this appropriation or is it in highways?

DR. WARRACK:

I believe we have to approach specific cases to know just where the division is, but in any case it would be of a capital nature and therefore in the capital rather than the operating part of the budget.

MR. BENOIT:

I have just one brief remark I'd like to make in conjunction with parks. I have others I'd like to make, but I'll refrain from making them. This is sort of an annual presentation that I make and because only about 30% of the people were here last year, I thought I'd make it again this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

You didn't make that presentation during the debate on the parks resolution.

MR. BENOIT:

My problem is that provincial parks seem to me a very important aspect of Land and Forests, as does fish and wildlife. And what I see is us spending something like \$500,000,000 for education and \$3,000,000 for parks. It also seems to me, and I have a lot of support in this idea in fact I inherited it and grabbed on to it that if we could get \$2,000,000 out of that education fund and they'd never notice it out of \$500,000,000, and it would go a long, long way in the Parks Branch. And if we're going to educate our children, and we're going to provide them with the type of information regarding the outdoors and this sort of thing that they need, and if we're going to attract tourists, and if we're going to get people to see Alberta first, and this sort of thing, I feel very much that we need to put more into this particular vote in Lands and Forests, and also in the Fish and Wildlife vote. \$2,000,000 here and another \$1,000,000 in Fish and Wildlife and cut it off Education would not be noticeable in Education, and it would certainly make a big show in this area.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make one little desperate pitch to achieve something out of the ashes of failure today to ask the hon. minister to give consideration in next year's estimates -- I know it can't be done in this year's -- maybe a study can be fitted in somewhere in this year's for provincial parks in the two major cities of Edmonton and Calgary. I feel utterly frustrated by the democratic process and on three occasions we have debated this subject at great length. Almost all members on both sides of the

48-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

House seem to agree -- and yet it was talked out and now dropped to the bottom of the Order Paper and it cannot surface again until the fall. So this is the only occasion on which I can make a plea to the hon. minister to evaluate on his own back, the merits of the case for giving parks to the two metropolitan cities where most of the people are, where most of the people will utilize these parks, where you will get the greatest value for the dollar, and where if you hesitate too long -- there won't be land left. It will all be eaten up by buildings.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to make this statement, but nevertheless...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Agreed.

MR. ZANDER:

That's enough from you, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter] It almost seems senseless to put the provincial parks under the Department of Lands and Forests. Don't you think there is a better place to put the parks -- which is under the Portfolio of Tourism and have it administered from there? Rather than having it included in the Department of Lands and Forests?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I think your point will be considered, Mr. Zander, and I don't imagine the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests would wish to reply to that just now.

MR. ZANDER:

Not this year -- but maybe next year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister indicated to me earlier in the House that he will consider the grants in the Greater Lake Park when his estimates were in the House. I was wondering if the hon. minister has considered that at this time and has any further information?

DR. WARRACK:

I don't recall that I specifically referred to it in terms of the estimates. You know there are an awful lot of...you see there is not only all of the 51 provincial parks -- the hon. member is talking about something else again. There is probably a couple of hundred of them all told, but I believe we have corresponded on that and as I recollect, the correspondence, the last paragraph, as a matter of fact, was that after the estimates, we'd know what money in fact we have, and then have something to allocate, rather than being in a hypothetical position. Isn't that how it was?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

...stay close to the end.

MR. BARTON:

I didn't really want to bring it up, but I'd feel that I'd left some of my constituents down if I didn't. It's the seriousness of the Lesser Slave Lake Provincial Park, especially the Martin River Campgrounds where...



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-89

DR. WARRACK:

I mailed you a letter today.

MR. BARTON:

OK.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister a question if he is seriously considering a gift of Keho Lake Park and all the facilities there? The County of Lethbridge is willing to give it to the Department of Lands and Forests. There is about \$70,000 to \$80,000 in equipment and improvements.

DR. WARRACK:

With the word considering, I consider anything, but they are also giving us the subsequent year's operating budget. The thing then that we have to do -- if something is a Provincial Park, it belongs to all of the people of Alberta, including things like regulations about snowmobiles. I think we really need to look at this in a policy area, such as to where do we need an additional Provincial Park as an area, and then what is the best place for it. Because, for example, if one that is suggested isn't the best place for it in the long run, once we make that decision, it is not reversible. That is why we need such an additional planning input, frankly, beyond what we have had in the past and why I am reluctant on a one-by-one basis to paint myself into a corner of having a lot of situations that, in the final analysis, am not that sure it is in the public interest.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to draw the attention of the members to a couple of very brief statements in the Annual Report of the Provincial Parks and to tie this in with the expanded campaign for tourists this coming year.

"In the fiscal year 1966-67, park attendance first reached the 3 million day-used patronage figure and this year, 1970-71 has seen the patronage exceed the 5 million mark. Accommodation was provided for 40,683 tents, an increase of 33 per cent over the previous year, 97,992 trailers, an increase of 24 per cent over the previous year."

And you have an extended program for tourists. We want to build that up into -- what is it -- our third industry. Yet, under income accounts, I see that there is a reduction of 63 per cent for expansion and development of the Provincial Parks. You have 51 Provincial Parks and you have a huge amount of \$155,300 for maintenance and development in these parks. Do you think you can even maintain them at the present level, Mr. Minister, without them going backwards with that sum?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, we are doing better than that too. We are going to think these things through before we get into a position with people piled upon the fragile environment, and boy, Martin Lake Campground has to be an example, in the hon. member's constituency right next to you of the kind of devastation that takes place when you don't handle these on a fully-planned basis. I think at some point we need to get into a re-think position of just what we are doing. For example, are there not some alternatives, particularly in the areas where there is a high intensity of people use? Is this really the kind of park we want, and if it is, let's go in the direction perhaps, as suggested

48-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, of orienting some of these, a certain category of these, towards people, orienting them towards their needs in terms of facilities; and in situations like that, it is also just possible that we ought to have some type of a fee structure. I am throwing up that balloon right now for your reaction -- well not reaction right now, but subsequent reaction -- [interjection] -- we've got one plus already.

But I say this for two reasons. One, we've got to figure out, as a public and a group of people who are responsible to see that the public service is delivered to people, how we are going to finance it. We need to put some thought into that and one possible way is the fee structure. You then have to be concerned about who you are charging and for that reason, I asked the Parks Division this fall to do a small analysis, as closely as they could ascertain, of the income levels of the people who actually use the parks. It turns out that the really low income people don't use the parks in Alberta because they can't get there. As far as the low income people are concerned, there isn't a park system and it seems like nobody planned for that. The really high income people don't use it very much either, because to middle-upper income level people who use it.

DR. WARRACK:

Then I ask you, should we be providing free park service, particularly in people-oriented services that require a great deal of public investment?

There's still another side to that question, and that is surely this -- and this is a point emphasized by not only the hon. Member for Highwood, but the hon. Member for Calgary Bow as well, and a number of people privately to me on our side -- too many to enumerate, really -- and that is, how can you involve the private enterprise and the private enterprise sector in this? One thing that would surely be clear is, they can't get involved unless there is a financial umbrella in the competitive source of that facility, for example in the Provincial Park. So I throw out the broom now, if we should be considering a fee structure to: (a) get the money that it would take to provide the facilities and particularly to people-orient them so that people with lower incomes and in the congested parts of Alberta could have the opportunity to have access which they don't have right now, and (b) to provide a financial umbrella that would allow people -- perhaps on a leasing of crown land or on a private land basis, to get into the private sector of recreation and park-like services to people of Alberta and to tourists.

Appropriation No. 1846, agreed to

\$2,953,085

MR. RUSTF:

Mr. Chairman, there is one more question here that I missed in the forestry operation and administration, and I think you mentioned that from time to time you hold quota sales of timber, and in light of some of the discussion you mentioned this evening about some of the ones that are more able to pay the higher prices, are you considering not accepting the highest tender in these sales?

DR. WARRACK:

Not at this time.

Total Income Account

agreed to without debate

\$22,999,445

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-91

---

Capital Account

MR. MINIELY:

There is Appropriation No. 1882 that we move to at this time, Capital Account.

Appropriation No. 1882 Forest Construction

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this, possibly the minister could outline the main airstrips, or ones that he's going to spend some money on. I notice that there is an expansion of the airstrips, or the upgrading of some of them.

MR. BARTON:

Just one question before you answer that. Is your department going to take over the administration of the northern development airstrips, as far as snowplowing and maintenance? I think this is...

DR. WARRACK:

First of all, to answer the last question, as of the moment, the plan is no. The reason is that another thing we have a dearth of in the Province of Alberta is a transportation policy. Surely we need a transportation policy in the Province of Alberta. It's our own province, to serve our own needs for resources and for the secondary industry development that I know we can achieve. If we're in agreement on that point, surely one part of that has got to be an air transportation component to a transportation policy. It ought to be handled in that way, taking into account the servicing of needs by industrial and other concentrations of people in the province, as well as the needs in terms of commercial airline service.

MR. BARTON:

Just one sec. I'm more interested in the isolated communities and the airstrips that we build there -- like Chipewyan Lakes, Cadotte Lake, Wabaska, Loon Lake airstrips -- the isolated ones.

DR. WARRACK:

I think it would be fair to say that the policy at this time would be for the Forestry Division of the Department of Lands and Forests to operate airstrips where we need them for forestry purposes, period. Now, there are exceptions to this at this time, as you well know; because one of the airstrips where there is commercial service -- that is a forestry airstrip -- is Slave Lake, also Footner Lake -- in the far north for those of you who don't know that area -- and also at Ft. Chip. That strikes me as a sort of non-policy stop-gap thing that we are stuck with for the time being because there wasn't a transportation policy, with an air transportation policy as a component. The service needs to be provided and someone needs to do it, so we're doing it.

Respecting air strips, I have all of the information here. All I have to do is find it. Would you like me to mention this by region which would be by forest, or would you refer to specific airports?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, what I had in mind was just a few of the main ones where there would be larger amounts of money spent.

48-92

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

DR. WARRACK:

Airports. OK.

MR. RUSTE:

If the hon. minister can't get it at this time, he can send it to me.

DR. WARRACK:

That is all right. Will it be satisfactory if I table it? I would be happy to do that.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

Appropriation 1882, agreed to \$ 987,260

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1883</u>	Capital Land Purchase	\$ 13,000
<u>Appropriation 1885</u>	Subdivision Development and Grazing Reserve Buildings	61,500

Appropriation 1886 Parks Development

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister -- this is the figure I alluded to a little while ago -- would this be prorated amongst the 51 parks, and just how is this figure arrived at, Mr. Minister? That is, if it can be answered easily. I don't want you to go to a lot of trouble for it.

DR. WARRACK:

The method of arriving at the figure is basically a matter of adding up components, and the components themselves being determined on a basis primarily of where money needs to be spent on development so that we don't have lying idle other previous development expenditures that could not be triggered for the use of people, unless we made the additional increment of expenditure. That is primarily, you will find, what the individual components came out as. When you add them up you get this.

Incidentally, noticing the difference between the last non-election fiscal year 1970-71 to 1972-73 is an increase of 25%.

Appropriation 1886, agreed to \$ 155,300

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1888</u>	Grazing Leases, Grazing Reserves, Forests, and Fish and Wildlife Development	\$ 955,160
---------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

Total Capital Account \$2,172,220

Department of Education

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1301 Minister's Office \$ 47,060

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-93

Appropriation 1302 General Administration

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I thought we could make some small start on the Department of Education tonight. Maybe I should begin by saying that I am delighted to have an opportunity in this committee to do more than move the committee into the Assembly, and the Assembly back into the committee.

I had thought initially that I might give a brief dissertation on education for about an hour. But that was a reaction that was not unexpected, so the other side suggested I might limit myself to 2-1/10 minutes. That might be a little difficult, but I will try to do that.

Very briefly I'll speak on General Administration 1302, and also delve into 1303, which is really the sum and substance of the grant system of education and is the appropriation which has the largest money involved.

Because there has been a change in the departmental structure of education and advanced education we have had new departments having been formed, I'll briefly outline to hon. members a reconciliation of some of the estimates. They are looking at last year's estimates which do not appear in this department.

One should note, for example, in the 1972-73 Supplement -- that is the small blue book -- on page 2, there are some major appropriations. For example, Universities, Colleges, Students' Finance, SALT, NAIT, Universities Commission and about 15 others, of a lesser nature, which have been transferred out of what was formerly the Department of Education, and are now in the hon. Mr. Foster's department.

In addition the capital estimate appropriations -- three of them totalling some \$41.3 million last year -- are now to be found in the Department of Advanced Education.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening I distributed to members in a brown envelope, some background information which I think might materially assist us in reducing the time spent on these appropriations this evening. Just to indicate how cost conscious members on this side are, regarding the envelopes, I received already five empty ones back from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, noting that I should use them again, and that they should be recycled! So any others which hon. members on that side wish to pass along I'll look at in that regard.

Now before going into the contents of this envelope, very briefly, I think hon. members will find either today in their mailboxes, or tomorrow, a detailed breakdown of the estimated amount of money that the various school divisions and counties within their constituencies will receive this year. I would want to emphasize that that is an estimate. The figures in there are based solely on projections of the Department and not on those available to local school boards regarding the number of students that will be enrolled in the school system for the 1972 year, and it might be wise to point out to the local school authorities that they should certainly not depend on that exact amount of money being paid.

Firstly, regarding the contents of the envelope circulated tonight, Mr. Chairman, there's a reconciliation of three appropriations which if they're read briefly in the appropriation book, do appear to be out of line -- very high. They reconcile the appropriations on what was formerly Special Education Services, Research and Development, and Examinations. The latter one, as an appropriation, disappears entirely and becomes part of the other two, 1325 and 1344. That is the reason for the apparent substantial increase of 158% in one appropriation, and 266% in appropriation

48-94

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

1344. When the three of them are put into a bundle, as the sheet shows, the net increase in all three departments, is some 19%.

Secondly Mr. Chairman, for 15 seconds, the second sheet outlines the School Foundation Program Fund -- how the monies are distributed, and without going through the whole sheet which begins with setting forth equalized assessment, estimated at 30 mills for 1972 at 3.6 billion dollars, the changes here are few in number. At the bottom you'll note there's one for unemployment insurance, the sum of \$1 million. This money it was thought was proper to deliver to school boards insofar as this is a new obligation they will have, by reason of recent federal unemployment insurance legislation, which will be an expense to be borne by boards -- which was extraordinary and which they did not anticipate.

If there are any questions in regard to the school foundation program fund sheet, I'd be happy to answer them.

The small booklet sets forth, I think in a very readable form, a very complex matter, and that is the whole concept and the regulations regarding the school foundation program fund: where the sources of money are, how it is distributed, what a class-room unit is, and what a staff support grant is. Attached to that are documents indicating how this has been updated this year, which is reflected in the press release of February 8, 1972, indicating that some extra \$19 million will be going into the fund -- if these appropriations are passed -- to be distributed to school boards this year.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's all I have to say at the moment. I'd be happy to answer questions.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments that I'd like to make tonight. My colleague to my left says two minutes. I'm not sure I can do that. I would simply say this at the outset. Basically as I see it, in the operation of the Department of Education this year, the department is in the third year of the finance program. Basically, the estimates are a continuation of what's transpired during the last two years as far as finance is concerned and in many other areas in the Department. It's simply a matter of having funds in there to meet the minimal obligations, and not a great deal more.

I will, at a more opportune time, take the opportunity to express my regrets that the government divided up the Department of Education. I think that was a serious mistake -- that my remarks could better be made there when we have the bill with regard to the Department of Advanced Education before us.

So, in the course of the estimates for the Department of Education, which, hopefully, we might almost be able to finish this evening, my questions will break down into three areas: one under this general area here, and a few under the foundation program, some under the area of instruction, and then some tag-end matters.

Under the matter of general administration, I would like the hon. minister to give us some indication whether he expects the fall session -- the government -- to bring forward, at that time, some of its recommendations and an indication of what approach he is going to take with regard to the Worth Commission, or the Commission on Education Planning.

Secondly, I would like some indication from the hon. minister now, or, if the hon. minister wants to get the questions off the Hansard, and then reply later, I am quite agreeable to that -- the government's reaction to the regional bargaining. The hon. minister has said that he doesn't expect any, or intend to introduce any,

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-95

legislative changes at this particular session. But I think it is important that we get some indication from the hon. minister as to how the government views the regional bargaining exercise, which we went through last year, and in which there were a number of work stoppages.

Thirdly, I would like some indication of the drug education program, what the department is doing in this area.

And, then, perhaps one of the most significant contributions made by the Commission of Educational Planning, was the stimulation that it gave to the business community in Alberta, namely the Alberta Chamber of Commerce, in its preparation of this brief, A Position Paper on Education in Alberta, by the Alberta Chamber. And, where I appreciate the position paper was made to the commission, I am aware that the government has received copies of it, and this may be an appropriate time for the minister to give us at least an initial reaction there.

My last question, in this particular area, deals with the question of educational research. I don't plan to go back and reiterate my statements earlier in that particular area, but I do think that it is important, in light of representation made to the government by the A.T.A., by the Trustees' Association, by the Home and School, and other groups, that we get some indication from the minister now, as to what he sees happening in the field of educational research. I would hope that the minister wouldn't say that this is going to be done within the Department of Education.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I think that some of these can be dealt with at this time.

Regarding the report of the Commission on Educational Planning, the Worth Report, which it is anticipated will be in publication about the middle of June, and which we hope will be a 'best-seller' in every sense of the word: initially it is not intended that the government on the day after the publication of the report would immediately react by saying that 'we agree with recommendations a, b, and c', and that 'we disagree with recommendations x, y, and z', because I think, in fairness to the commission and the fact that it has laboured some months to produce this, we should carefully consider it. But also it is important, we think, to get feedback from the widest possible Alberta community -- not just professional educators, but everyone else, as to what they think about this report -- which, after all, purports to point the direction for the next 30 years in education -- education being part of society, part of Alberta life.

Certainly I think we would anticipate some legislative changes being introduced in the fall sitting of this session this year, regarding recommendations of the Worth Report. There will be, undoubtedly, some recommendations which will have a high priority in terms of a decision by government as to whether they will be implemented, and how.

The arrangement for monitoring feedback, which has been and is being devised at the moment, will operate through the Cabinet Committee on Education, composed of the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, and myself. This committee will be the central core to which all feedback from all sources in Alberta, regarding reaction to the Worth report, will come. In other words, reaction from the, say, professional groups such as the school trustees, the A.T.A., and the Home and School, will come to that committee, which is essentially the policy committee. Reactions from persons writing in to newspapers, on radio talk-back shows, reactions from other groups such as the Association

48-96

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

of Municipal Districts and Counties, the Alberta Federation of Labour, the Alberta Chamber of Commerce -- all these will be monitored.

The one area in which we felt there might be some difficulty in getting reaction, in which we have made some novel approaches, is that concerning students. Generally, they do not have a voice which can be focussed in such a way that the opinions are known. They do not have a provincial organization and, accordingly, we have arranged through, and as a part of, the STEP program, to have a number of students involved in spreading the message of the Worth Report around the province over the summer, and getting feed-back from students in high schools and in universities and colleges.

We feel this is particularly important because it is for the student that the whole report is devised, in the sense that it is for his or her benefit over the next 30 years that the general thrust of the report will be.

Regarding point two, the question of regional bargaining -- I think that, insofar as that subject is more closely related to The Labour Act and the activities of the Minister of Labour during last fall's situation in Bow Valley, to which I'm sure the hon. member opposite is alluding, the Minister of Labour and Manpower in his estimates could more properly deal with the question of where we're going in that situation.

Regarding the drug education program -- there have not been any major changes of direction in the policies which were initiated by the previous government. The drug films which they produced are still being sent out to schools that wish to have them. Indeed, I would have to say that I think there has been a slightly noticeable decrease in the intensity of interest as reflected by letters to the department and my office regarding the drug situation. I would hasten to say I don't think in any way that reflects a new lack of concern or interest by parents in the drug situation.

Regarding the brief of the Alberta Chamber of Commerce -- I recall receiving that some time ago and briefly glancing through it. I'm not in a position to definitively comment on all of its recommendations. I know many of them have caused quite a substantial reaction from a number of educators in the province and, indeed, from myself. I certainly would be prepared to comment. Perhaps the second reading of The School Act which will be introduced shortly, might be an opportunity on which I could give my reaction to the various points raised by the Alberta Chamber of Commerce.

Regarding educational research -- I think perhaps I should make it clear, initially, that we have certainly not made any decision that all educational research in the future will be carried on by the Department of Education. Members opposite and, indeed, many others have indicated the concern they have about a total in-house research concept. That is not to say that some projects would be done by the department.

At the moment, the educational research situation is standing in the position where as soon as the Worth Report comes in and its ideas are available we will be able to move into whatever is the best kind of educational research facility, hopefully for a number of years ahead.

I would not endorse an educational research facility that had the total power on its own to initiate and decide upon the areas of education in which research would be done. I think it is crucially important that if the government is going to, in any way, stimulate or initiate research that it not be done in such a way, either directly or indirectly, that what the government desires as a result



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-97

is proven by researchers. This is a concern expressed about departmental research that we would hope to avoid.

By the same token, I feel it would be money wasted in educational research to have some agency totally outside government be able to initiate research in areas which it thought were important. If we're to spend thousands of dollars in this area I think we have to ensure that the research is going to probably have some practical application in future years. Therefore, I would hope that in future any government-funded educational research facility would not go off on the tangent of simply being a facility to carry out curiosity research but, rather, would be doing research in areas of education spending -- and it's a quarter of a billion dollars this year -- so that we can practically apply the results of the research. I think program budgeting is one example of potential there.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I may as well give you three or four little things to answer as well right now. After all, I'm not going to be the one who's going to prolong this discussion but I think there are some things I know you'd like to comment on.

Number one is the regional offices. I'm just wondering what your attitude is toward the regional offices that have been set up throughout the province, I don't know exactly how many there are now. Do you look on these favourably? Do you expect to expand on them? Do you think they're really providing a good service for education in the province of Alberta and I presume this relates primarily to the rural areas because I really don't think the cities are using them at all. I would have to admit that when they were set up it was right after The School Act 1970 was set up and passed, at which time there were a lot of government superintendents who might have been sort of expendable for a little while. With all of the greatest of respects to my colleague and friend, the former Minister of Education, I was just wondering if we were just providing jobs for people who had no other place to go or whether they had a real service to perform?

I would like your comments on that. Are you going to expand them, relocate them, or what are your long range plans if you have made that assessment?

I was also concerned about your remarks the other day about the freeze on school buildings. Now I don't disagree with that by any stretch of the imagination, but the part that kind of worried me was when you said something to the effect that you may rescind some approvals. Now once a school building has been approved by the School Buildings Branch and architects are engaged and they start doing work, the minute they pick up a pencil it costs money. In other words, if there are costs being assessed to the School Board for plans at any stage whatsoever, I think in all fairness that we must consider just how you are going to deal with that situation.

I notice there is an increase in the appropriation for private schools, and I would like to know what your feeling is towards private schools in the Province of Alberta, for approval of them. Is this increase in appropriation here due to the increased enrolment in private schools, or do you intend to give them a larger grant than the one they have now, which I believe -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong is \$150 per student.

Then there is another one that has been bothering me and I never have been able to figure it out. This new program, I may as well turn to it now and get some answers right away. The Appropriation 1319 which has to do with mental health -- I'm just wondering how that relates to, on page 71, Appropriation 2572, where there was \$1 million I think, for a new program in mental health that was to be

48-98

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

reverted to education. I never was able to get clear in my own mind, just what the connection between those two appropriations was.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly on the subject of regional offices, I think that the jury is still out regarding the long-term future of those offices. Initially last June, July and August, there were six of these set up in Grande Prairie, Athabasca, Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, and Lethbridge. As I mentioned recently, the Athabasca office will be closed as of July 1st and consolidated in Edmonton by reason of request to that effect almost universally by the school authorities in that particular area.

As I initially said, I'm considering these offices at the moment to be, still I think, of an experimental and pilot nature, which I think was probably considered they would be when they were set up originally. Whether or not the role that they now have -- or originally were set up to have -- will continue, I don't know. I certainly feel that in education, the extent to which we can decentralize some of the decision making is a valid approach. But on the other hand, I would not want to see any new administrative layer set up in the educational system because the communication is difficult enough now between parents and boards, and the department and schools. So as I say, the jury is still out as to the future of them. I think we're prepared to see if they can carry out the function for which they were originally intended. We may, when the Worth Report comes out, give them entirely new functions.

One other suggestion which was made to me the other day, is that many boards being interested in having a regional approach -- especially things such as special services -- might wish to have an option of operating their own regional office or deciding on its functions at that level, rather than having the department or the government decide. However I think a fair trial is what the situation needs at the moment.

Regarding the school building comments -- there was not a freeze. I would underline the fact that the holding pattern which we have established is not a moratorium or a freeze because...

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, it was rescinding some that -- it was that which really concerned me. It wasn't really the holding of the new buildings.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes. What I was referring to there is, any school addition or construction contract which had not yet been tendered for and which is in the department. Some of them have been in the School Buildings Branch, they have been awaiting application or sitting in the School Building Branch for many months. These, I feel, would have to be subject to the review. Certainly if there was any situation where a board would be under a material financial disadvantage by any sort of change or stoppage, then I think we would look kindly at that.

What we are doing essentially is asking boards to justify the need for a new building or an addition by showing, not just the situation in their particular school area, but in the whole area within maybe two blocks, or a mile, or a county, or number of subdivisions.

Regarding private schools -- the increase this year in the private school grant is simply six per cent as it has been for the rest of the School Foundation Program. In future, I think that we should seriously consider whether or not there should be some

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-99

legislative and statutory authority for having private schools. At the moment, private schools in this province exist simply on the goodwill of the minister by regulation, who, if he wished to, could exercise such authority as would put them out of operation. I think that there probably is a place for private schools in Alberta in future years. Again I think -- after the Worth Report is in, and I am sure this will be dealt with -- that the whole question of the position of private schools and the public and separate school system must be looked at. A policy has to be established so there are no ad hoc local arrangements about private schools, but there is some long-term policy so that private schools know where they stand. There may be legislation then, this fall, regarding private schools.

Concerning handicapped children, and I think the appropriation referred to there was 1317: \$100,000 of that appropriation relates to monies which have been budgeted in previous years by personnel services. The \$1 million dollars is going to be used to provide a number of programs that we are now looking into, particularly in the area of diagnosis and assessment at an early age of youngsters when they are just starting in the regular school system. I think that there are many cases where teachers are not made aware -- early enough in the elementary system -- of youngsters with learning disabilities or autistic or aphasic youngsters or with hearing handicaps or visual handicaps. There are other proposals which have been suggested and may relate to the regional offices or perhaps a concept of a regional office in one of the six remaining or some of the six remaining, five remaining regional offices, to have there a regional diagnostic and assessment centre. This is another concept that we are exploring, the question also of starting, in 1973 in January, grants for teachers, professional opportunity rooms and this kind of thing. We are looking at a number of areas in here where these monies would be spent.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just for clarification, that six per cent that you mentioned for private schools, you are just going to increase the \$150 by six per cent. I understood that correctly?

MR. HYNDMAN:

That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to pose three questions to the hon. minister. The first one was brought to my attention by the brief of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association that you have no doubt read, Mr. Minister. It concerns this CRU formula of 26 for a full grant and 13 for half a grant. The point they make is that in the rural public school systems this is spread over the entire system, so that even if there is an odd number they can spread it over the system and they don't lose any grants. But in the case of the separate schools, there are frequently too few schools in the system and as a consequence they often lose out. The point they make in their brief -- I know, I talked to the local secretary of the Separate School Division in my home community, and he argues that the Separate School Division there loses about 8 or 10 per cent as a consequence of this formula.

So my first question to you is: are you considering any change in that CRU formula so that the disparity that one senses exist can be ironed out?

The second question stems from discussions I have had with the chairman of the local Public School Board who feels that the grant structure for the construction of schools, especially for communities as far away from Edmonton as the Peace River Bloc, is probably a bit

48-100

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

unfair because first of all, we don't have any resident contractors in the area large enough to take on school construction. As a consequence we don't have the competitive bidding. Frequently in the bids, according to him, the contractors add on their travelling costs to the cost of travelling from Edmonton or whatever centre gets the contract to construct the school. His submission to me was that the money available just doesn't go as far in the rural areas.

So my second question is, have you given any consideration to, perhaps, some adjustment in the grant structure for the provision of new schools in those sections of the province that are more remote.

My third question comes from a submission to me by some teachers in Edmonton about a report on inner-city schools, prepared by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower when he was working for the Edmonton School Board. I don't raise this to embarrass him. I raise it because, in reading the report very briefly, I felt that there were a lot of excellent points made in it, a lot of rather penetrating observations about the lack of equality of educational opportunity in the inner-city schools in our two major cities, especially in the City of Edmonton where the report concentrates. My third question then is, what consideration is the government giving to special programs designed to uplift the inner-city schools of our two major cities?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, regarding the CRU, the classroom unit: certainly there are inequities which can result in small school jurisdictions by reason of what educators refer to as the 'truncation problem', meaning divisibility or non-divisibility of 26 or 13. In looking to next year, the whole method of distributing grants to schools is wide open. We're not proceeding with any preconceived notion that we will start with the CRU. There are six other factorial combinations used across North America, and we're going to be looking at all of them. Certainly one of the aims will be to ensure that the small rural Catholic school districts which do face a very real problem and do get some assistance by the small jurisdiction allowance this year, totalling \$400,000 that that inequity can be either removed or reduced from what it is now.

Regarding the grant structure for schools: certainly we will be looking again next year at a new structure. The present support price of \$15.50 for elementary schools, and \$16.25 for junior highs has very recently been found to be inadequate by boards who have been receiving tenders, very few tenders because of the supply and demand, of up to \$2 higher than that. Of course, once one changes any of these base figures, which were reduced after the Ried-Crowther report recently, about a year and a half ago, then they become the new base. However, I think in many cases it can be argued with facts that there may well be rural differentials by reason of the distance the contractors have to travel. This means there are fewer contractors able to bid in a certain area. We take that into consideration, and also the question of whether building an addition to a school may reasonably cost more than a new school. This has been suggested as being something worthy of study as well.

On point three, inner-city schools: the Member for Edmonton Norwood has very forcibly brought this to my attention, and I was visiting the Parkdale School some months ago. About two months ago I made reference to a new School Life Extension Program, which is designed basically to zero in on those schools, and to provide virtually unlimited funds from the Alberta Municipal Finance Corporation for renovation and upgrading -- not just in the sense of changing partitions around, but even to the stage of repairing and replacing plumbing and heating and this kind of thing. I think there is a great deal of evidence, especially that which I have received from the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, to indicate that

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-101

perhaps we face the dichotomy of having the youngsters who need extra schooling and high-class schooling most, in areas of the city where the school has been built many years ago and are admittedly not of the same standard as those of the new subdivisions.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just to follow on that tenet -- you do have a committee, do you not, that's studying and bringing in recommendations for finance for another three years? Don't you have a committee going right now studying school finance?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, the Minister's Advisory Committee on Finance is dealing with this in one way, and it is one of a number of committees that are now working on this situation.

MR. GRUENWALD:

The one you were referring to -- that's one where you have representative ASTA-ATA members at large -- the same one that was set up by the previous administration about three years before this formula was set up -- you have that type of a committee working right now, don't you?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, that one still exists. There are a number of committees -- seven or eight -- like that, which will probably continue until the Worth Report comes in. At that time there may be quite a number of changes, and we may have all these committees changed or started afresh. But certainly, that committee will be canvassed for its opinion regarding any new schemes that we are going to bring out.

Appropriation 1302 total agreed to \$ 393,290

Appropriation 1303 Grants to Schools

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman I have two comments here in the area of the foundation program or grants to schools. Might I say, Mr. Minister, that whatever program they come up with as far as school finance is concerned -- and I am not being the least little bit facetious here at all -- one of the real problems that is going to be faced is if you do away with the plebiscite idea -- and there is nothing sacred about the plebiscite. But if the province is going to take over all the financing -- or even give a basic amount to school boards -- unless there is something that is going to keep the increase in per-pupil cost down, regardless of how much money the government puts into the program next year, within three or four or five years you will be in the same kind of situation the province was about three years ago.

I recall back to 1960 or 1961 when the Foundation Program came in. It was hailed as a very fine venture and so on. But it wasn't very long before the supplementary requisitions got to an almost unbearable amount. The only point in raising this now is to say to you, in coming out with this new program, that unless you are able to devise some system -- and I say again, the plebiscite system isn't sacred at all -- unless you come up with some system that will help school boards and the department keep the per-pupil increase costs down to a reasonable amount yearly, it won't be very long until you will be in a situation where that portion that you will leave with the local taxpayer is going to become unbearable once again.

48-102

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

---

You may have seen an article in the Edmonton Journal not too long ago. If we go back to years like 1965, '66, '67, '68 and '69, the per-pupil costs were increasing at the rate of -- during 1966, '67, '68 and '69 -- in excess of 10% and three of those years, in excess of 15%. This is the Edmonton Public School Board according to the Journal. Now, the Journal has once been wrong. The point I want to make is that there will be a real push on behalf of boards, on behalf of teachers, and people who want additional services provided. I am sure the hon. minister will be swamped with them, and be sympathetic to a lot of them. Unless at the very outset you build in something that is going to keep the cost down -- and keep that cost reasonable within some kind of percentage increase yearly, even if it is nothing more than a guideline -- I really think your very best efforts will be down the drain in a very short period of time. I raise it now because I wouldn't want to be in a situation of coming back in a couple of years and saying, "you should have done this."

The situation isn't too much unlike the problem the hon. Minister of Health faces in the hospital situation. Perhaps the advice that Mr. Henderson gave there, that there will always be new programs in education, new ideas come forward, and they will be worthwhile, but somehow we have to say to people, "look, you have got to decide which is the best; which one do you really want to do?" With great respect to educators, we never run out of ideas as to how to spend money.

The second point I would like to make is in the question of the new program that is coming up. If you are going to make any reference to teachers in the formula, the three-year consideration we use now is one of the mistakes that was made in the former program. It does discriminate against some of the systems, namely Edmonton Public as an example, because the qualifications of their teachers are well above that.

The other point I would make in that area is -- and this is in the form of a question -- did you give any consideration this year in the course of working out the amount of funds you have in the foundation program, to increasing the ratio for elementary education? It is now what? -- one, 1.2, 1.8 or something like that. Did you give any consideration to upping that one to 1.204. I know the Provincial Treasurer is frowning. It would be costly, right? -- but, that really would have been a way to emphasize elementary education which in many areas has been overlooked in the past.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, briefly, certainly we are cognizant of the first two points made by the hon. gentleman opposite. On the question of the formula for this year. Because the one, 1.2, 1.8 formula is essentially one of the tender balancing points of the whole two-year plan, it was felt after an initial review of it that this is something that we will be looking at next year. Certainly there are strong arguments that can be made that the real keystone of education perhaps could be the elementary area of however one wants to describe that, because maybe the areas of Grades I to VI, VII to IX and X to XII are even out of date. Maybe the Carnegie unit is out of date. So we'll be looking at I think, an increase in the proportion of assistance for elementary education.

I think part of the problem is one of social attitudes towards elementary education, towards elementary teachers, which I think is an unfortunate one. Too many people think an elementary teacher really is not able to make it in high school whereas there is solid evidence, arguments that I can understand, to suggest that a good elementary is a pretty rare and precious person -- perhaps far more valuable because that is where the die is cast, not in grade XII, not in Grade X, not in Grade VIII. There, perhaps, is where we have to have much greater emphasis on future years.

May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-103

Appropriation 1303 total agreed to \$235,234,710

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1305</u>	Textbooks and Readers	\$1,071,400
<u>Appropriation 1306</u>	Miscellaneous Grants	97,410
<u>Appropriation 1310</u>	Teachers' Pension Fund	7,850,000
<u>Appropriation 1311</u>	Allowances for Aged Teachers	3,600
<u>Appropriation 1312</u>	Minister's Committees	10,000
<u>Appropriation 1314</u>	Grants to Private Schools	680,000
<u>Appropriation 1315</u>	School Buildings	340,020
<u>Appropriation 1317</u>	Personnel Office	36,520
<u>Appropriation 1319</u>	Educational Services - Handicapped Children	1,100,000
<u>Appropriation 1321</u>	Field Services	1,876,050
<u>Appropriation 1322</u>	Counselling and Guidance	45,510
<u>Appropriation 1323</u>	Registrar	106,240
<u>Appropriation 1324</u>	Board of Reference	2,000
<u>Appropriation 1325</u>	Special Education Services	527,070
<u>Appropriation 1331</u>	Correspondence School Branch	1,836,840
<u>Appropriation 1332</u>	Alberta School for the Deaf	913,570

Appropriation 1341 Curriculum

MR. CLARK:

Just to break the monotony, there are a number of questions I would like to ask the hon. minister in the field of curriculum. What really does the hon. minister consider the priority area in curriculum? During the last few years there has been a tremendous change in the field of social studies. In what area do you see the next review in.

Secondly, what has been the experience of credits for religious education, which was started just last year? Do you have an assessment of the work experience program?

Thirdly, the position paper, you indicated to the House some time ago, with regard to Canadian content, what funds in -- am I going too fast? -- what funds in the -- where do we find funds for the implementation of the points made in that position paper?

This might be an appropriate time, also, to ask about the PBBES, and what future you see in that particular area. Where do you stand, now, on this question of modification of the school year?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I think those all deserve more attention than I could give them very briefly, and the figures, for example, on the credits for religious education, I don't yet have. So, I would be happy to either hold that or deal with all these points in the second reading of the School Act Introduction, whichever is...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed, Mr. Clark?

Appropriation 1341 total agreed to \$ 492,840

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1342 Audio Visual Services 607,550

Appropriation 1343 Educational Television

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman. What is the situation as far as CARET is

48-104

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

concerned, in Calgary? It is now through its pilot project stage. MEETA, here in Edmonton, is, I guess, in the second or third year of the pilot project. Can the hon. minister give us some indication of what he sees, at least in this year, in the field of ETV across the province.

On the question of the possible use of educational television, meeting some of the unmet needs in the area of pre-Grade I educational experiences: there had previously been some discussions with the province of Ontario, the people of Sesame Street, and so on. Are you following this up, or where does that stand at this particular time?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, briefly the situation with CARET and MEETA is that they are now being evaluated by the Alberta Educational Communications Authority, and a report on that should be available in about June of this year. The pilot program is ending and, as of the spring of 1973 -- this report is being done in the department by Mr. Morton, with the assistance of Mr. Shorter, and a number of other people on the AECA. I think, in view of the fact that we will want to assess a long-range plan in educational television, and it is a horrendously expensive area in which to make decisions in either software or hardware, because once you make a decision you are locked in for millions of dollars. . . bearing that in mind, I think we will probably wish to try to work out some arrangement, whereby CARET and MEETA would continue on some interim plan, certainly through this year, because television programming requires a good deal of pre-planning. For example, the MEETA situation and CARET would be starting now to work out programs for the fall and for next year.

As is known by hon. members, the television satellite will be rotating over Canada in November of this year, and this means that when the MEETA agreement expires, and we will be looking to getting an extension of it next spring, that MEETA will go -- subject to arrangements which can be made with CBC -- off-air and onto cable in Edmonton -- which does pose a number of problems, one being that the off-air transmission signal covers 60 miles around Edmonton, and cable does not.

With CARET in Calgary, a number of the partners have decided, of their own volition, that the decision they made originally, that they wanted a partnership organization, should not continue with them being partners. So, CARET as it now stands, has essentially a higher-education flavour, and it will be continuing on a reduced budget for this year.

Regarding the pre-Grade I situation, we decided not to get into a massive million-dollar approach to carrying out early childhood education solely by television, although recognizing the benefits of this being transmitted over the province. We have, though, had some people from Ontario meeting with the Alberta Education Communications Authority. We will be keeping in close touch with them, realizing that the production of these films and facilities can best be carried out on a co-operative basis between those provinces -- three in Canada -- who are largely involved in educational television.

MR. GRUENWALD:

On this CARET and MEETA, now, the amount of money that you put into that -- I understand that those two boards that are involved in Calgary are a little less than happy with what has happened in the past, even their own investment in it. I think that they are really not convinced that they have really got their money's worth out of it. I think they are just about ready to pack it up, from their own local point of view. What's the ratio, or, in other words, how much



May 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

48-105

money has been put into the programs in relation to those school boards themselves? Has there been a formula at all?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is one but I'm not sure exactly what it is, but I think the provincial contribution has been close to 50%. The province has been essentially a silent partner in these partnerships: it has been allowing the other partners to decide on production and policy. For example, I think the Calgary public board put in about a sixth. However, those boards having decided to pull out, it may be that we will not be a silent partner in future. Indeed, CARET, of course, will be saving some money in not broadcasting to the 26 schools which it now does by cable.

MR. BARTON:

Just before we leave this. Is it under your department that the vocational training at Grouard comes? Which one?

MR. HYNDMAN:

That's under Advanced Education.

Appropriation 1343 total agreed to \$ 596,400

Appropriation 1344 Research and Development

MR. CLARK:

In this particular area might I say that the minister and the government have made a mistake in the removal of Grade XII examinations. Now I don't expect the minister to come back tomorrow and tell us that he's going to change his mind --

MR. HYNDMAN:

That's Grade IX.

MR. CLARK:

In the removal of the Grade XII examinations -- you indicated XII a few days ago to us. Grade IX? Well then the mistake hasn't been made yet. If it wasn't for the hour I would launch into quite a harangue perhaps as to why I seriously think this should not be done. I know there are number of people both inside and outside the department who will continue to push for the removal of the Grade XII examinations, Alberta is one of the few provinces in Canada that still has departmental examinations.

A point can be made for saying it puts additional pressure on students and so on. I'm sure the minister has heard some of the arguments. But, on the other hand, some place there has to be some measure of some sort of a standard, and I would suggest that if a decision is made to pull out of Grade XII examinations -- and I emphasize the point I don't think we should -- then an effort then should be made through the Council of Education Ministers across Canada to encourage some Canada-wide organizations to become involved in some national examinations which could then, at the will of the student, be taken or not.

I think if the minister would check he will find that this is done in Great Britain, where some national associations or organizations have examinations which students then have the option of taking or not taking. Of course, if a student takes the examination and depending on how well he does or doesn't do on it then it's to his credit and it certainly helps in his future endeavours.

48-106

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 11th 1972

While I'm pleased that the minister hasn't made the mistake yet. I just trust it doesn't happen in the course of the next year.

MR. LEE:

I would support what was just mentioned by Mr. Clark and one vehicle you might use in the preparation of an examination like this is through the Council of Ministers and perhaps the development of some type of standardized examination as a college entrance.

Appropriation 1344 total agreed to \$ 703,310

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1345</u>	Communications	\$ 80,410
<u>Appropriation 1351</u>	Examinations	Nil

Total Income Account \$254,651,800

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report substantial progress and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I gather its agreed by the members of the Assembly that we report.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain estimates, made substantial progress and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader moves that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 11:39 pm.]